

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

ANTICIPATION is whetted whenever we hear of one who has become master of a subject sitting back, as it were, to survey the whole field and to give us his *multum in parvo*. When the writer is Dr. Vincent TAYLOR and the theme is the Atonement we are not likely to be disappointed. His latest book, *The Cross of Christ*,¹ consists of eight lectures, delivered to a mixed audience at Drew University last year, on the meaning of the Atonement. These follow the contours of the ground covered in the famous trilogy but are by no means a summary. 'I think,' Dr. TAYLOR explains, 'that theologians ought not to be in bondage to what they have already written, but should strive repeatedly to express themselves more adequately, seeking . . . to grow older learning every day.' So we have here a brief but fresh and independent attempt to set forth the meaning of the doctrine of the Cross.

For Dr. TAYLOR Scripture is the touchstone of faith. As always, what he writes is solidly based thereon. Indeed the bulk of the book is given to a careful examination of the New Testament data for the doctrine. We begin with a question: 'How can an event which took place during an afternoon in A.D. 29 or 30 be of decisive importance for the Christian of to-day?' The answer is that 'while the Cross is an event in history, it is not an isolated event, nor only an event with abiding consequences, but also the invasion of God into human history for the saving and blessing of men.' The blessing comes in Christ and His Cross. Of that Cross Dr. TAYLOR expounds the meaning beginning with the ideas in the mind of Jesus as He contemplated His Messianic suffering and death, so far as we can trace it in the earliest records. These are the ideas behind the preaching and worship of the Early Church. On them its great teachers worked—and especially St. Paul, the writer to the Hebrews, and St. John, whose interpretations are treated in detail.

Readers of Dr. TAYLOR's earlier works will not be surprised to find that he lays great stress on the

¹ Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net.

category of *sacrifice*. 'His vocation was interpreted by Jesus in terms of the Old Testament conceptions of sacrifice. . . . For Him, we may infer, sacrifice is a representative offering in which men can share, making it the vehicle and organ of their own approach to God.' That Christ is the One Sacrifice for sin is stressed especially by the Epistle to the Hebrews. Paul, on the other hand, while making use of sacrificial words and ideas emphasizes that His sacrifice in a true sense becomes ours also. 'In this situation we see the true unity of New Testament teaching, namely that elements prominent in one teacher are supplemented by those emphasized by another.'

How may we see the meaning of the Cross to-day? To the perennial question, Dr. TAYLOR attempts an answer, based on many years of study and reflection, in his final chapter. The character of the doctrine of the Atonement he defines as 'the work of God in Christ for man's salvation and renewal. It is an attempt to explain . . . how man is delivered from his pride and his overweening confidence in himself and is brought into a true and abiding fellowship with God, and so is empowered to fulfil his divine destiny as an individual and as a member of society. This end man cannot fulfil by any effort or power of his own. Only by the act of God in Christ can he attain to communion with God and to the knowledge of life in its fullness.' Of this, Dr. TAYLOR finds the best descriptive word to be *reconciliation*, as having 'the advantage of including all that is meant by "redemption" and "forgiveness" with the added merit of describing the restoration of personal relations with God, broken by sin, and their permanent security in an ever growing fellowship of love.'

His account of the meaning of the Atonement, which may be called the Sacrificial Theory, Dr. TAYLOR offers as a faith for to-day, based on Scripture and, he believes, also in harmony with the mind of the Church as reflected in her teaching

and worship. As to the teaching of the Church, he devotes one lecture to a discussion of the great books written between 1856 and 1935. Next to Scripture there is no better way to the meaning of the Cross than by examining the outstanding discussions. Against the background of the four main types of view which have persisted through the centuries, he describes the work of the ten great theologians of the Cross, from McLeod Campbell to Brunner—it would be interesting to know how far readers' choices coincide with these of Dr. TAYLOR—and sums up the fivefold tendency of this period. This chapter is quite masterly. As regards worship, Dr. TAYLOR sees the Christian Eucharist to stand in closest connexion with Christ's atoning work and His own estimate of its meaning. 'Sacramental communion is a communal expression of faith conditioned by the use of symbols of Christ's appointing. It is not fundamentally different from, and is certainly not an alternative to, personal faith in Christ. . . . In the Lord's Supper . . . the believer is brought into communion with Christ, pleads His Sacrifice, and shares in the power of His saving ministry.'

Dr. TAYLOR has written many larger books but it may be doubted whether he has ever written a richer book, gathering as it does the fruits of his massive learning and, surely, touched by the illumination of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. Johnson said of Dryden that he appeared to have no other art than that of expressing with clearness what he thought with vigour; and, much later, Somerset Maugham in his autobiography has said that he himself had three aims in writing—lucidity, simplicity, euphony. If these are the tests of writing, it may well be said that of all modern theologians Dr. John BAILLIE satisfies them best of all. *The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought*,¹ is an admirable example of Dr. BAILLIE's clear thinking and lucid writing.

In the early days there was a clear distinction between rational and revealed knowledge. Rational knowledge was knowledge which could be gained by the unaided exercise of man's power of thinking; revealed knowledge was knowledge given by direct communication from God. St. Thomas Aquinas, for instance, drew the distinction between 'an ascent, by the natural light of reason, through created things to the knowledge of God,' and 'a descent by the mode of revelation of divine truth which exceeds the human intellect, yet not as demonstrated to our sight, but as a communica-

tion delivered for our belief.' *Scire* and *credere* were two entirely different things.

In the break up which followed the Middle Ages there was a change. The seventeenth and eighteenth century rationalists did not abandon this theoretical distinction, but the more extreme of them did go the length of denying that any revelation had been vouchsafed to men, and of asserting that our only knowledge of divine things comes by the unaided powers of human reason. Others, the majority, declared that there was such a thing as supernatural revelation, but held that it was a mere 'republication' for the benefit of weaker minds of truths which an honest exercise of reason could have reached.

Spinoza held an intermediate position. Reason for him held sway over the whole area of truth. Revelation is concerned only with obedience and piety. Revelation does indeed announce certain doctrines, but they are very simple; and the obedience they demand coincides with the moral demands of reason. 'Yet revelation performs one necessary and valuable service—it assures us that the common man as well as the philosopher can achieve blessedness.' The reformers did not deny the distinction between natural and revealed knowledge, but they did hold that 'human reason was now so damaged as an instrument as to yield little or no reliable knowledge of things divine.' Calvin said that natural things could supply us with innumerable proofs of divine things but our sinful blindness and dullness are such that we derive no profit from them. Kant was influenced by the romantic movement; he revolted against rationalist theology. 'The theoretical exercise of reason, he contends, cannot conduct us to any such knowledge of super-sensible reality as religion requires. "I must therefore," he writes, "abolish knowledge to make room for faith."' But he was kin to Spinoza in that for him faith was a rational faith, 'being in fact an exercise of what he called practical reason.'

Schleiermacher rested theology 'neither on authoritatively communicated truths nor on truths excogitated by the speculative reason but on what he calls the religious self-consciousness of the Christian community.' That self-consciousness is a sense of complete dependence upon God, and in particular of the dependence upon the redemption wrought by God in Jesus Christ. Ritschl had it that all theological knowledge rests on 'the value-judgments of faith.' 'We know the nature of God and Christ only in their value for us.' In nineteenth century Britain it was significant that Lord

¹ Oxford University Press; 15s. net.

Gifford founded the famous Gifford lectureship with a view to the promotion of natural theology treated as a strictly natural science like astronomy or chemistry without reference to or reliance upon any supposed special, exceptional or so-called 'miraculous revelation.' But in the very lectures John Caird could write: 'The primary organ of religious knowledge is not reason but faith.'

So then Dr. BAILLIE begins with this masterly summary of previous thought. Let us now see the salient points which he goes on to distinguish. Revelation is to be understood 'in the sense of a self-disclosure of God.' Both the Council of Trent and the Vatican Council of 1869-1870 identified that revelation with a written revelation, but, as William Temple had it, 'What is offered to man's apprehension in any specific revelation is not truth concerning God but the living God Himself.' 'It is not knowledge *that*,' says Dr. BAILLIE, 'and no mere knowledge *about*; it is knowledge *of*. . . God does not give us information by communication; He gives us Himself in communion.'

The knowledge is twofold; it is knowledge of the human predicament, and of the way out of it; that is to say, it is saving knowledge. Herrmann had it that only that which rescues us from our predicament makes the impression of genuine revelation. If this is the case, it is clear that revelation is revelation *in events*. As Brunner said: 'Revelation is event.'

But it is equally obvious that the event must be received, understood, interpreted. 'The completed act of divine revelation consists in the intercourse of event and interpretation.' And it is the God-given power to make that interpretation which is inspiration.

The task of the writers of Scripture was to convey to others the illumination which they themselves had received. It would be almost ridiculous to suppose that these writers were enabled to make

this interpretation, and were then given no kind of help to communicate it to others. In that sense there is something which may be called verbal inspiration.

But how then are we to know when the revelation is central and the inspiration is real? In the last analysis there is only one test, the test which Luther long ago applied. Everything is to be judged by the measure in which it *preaches Christ*. Here is the final test.

The last pages of Dr. BAILLIE's book are an epilogue 'The Challenge of Revelation.' And in them he indeed challenges. If ever we doubt that God is revealing Himself to us, he bids us to face two searching questions—'Are you sure there is not something which He is plainly saying to you, and to which you are not giving ear?' And, 'If you have listened, have you obeyed?' Here is a book in which theology and challenge go hand in hand—as indeed they always must.

Papyrus Bodmer II has already received attention in the national Press (*Times*, 28th December 1956; *Manchester Guardian*, 10th January 1957). A full critical account of the papyrus and its textual significance cannot yet be given, but it is already clear from preliminary announcements (especially in *Novum Testamentum* i. 153ff.) that its importance is great. It contains, almost without hiatus, the first fourteen chapters of the Fourth Gospel, and the writing may be dated in the neighbourhood of A.D. 200. It is thus perhaps earlier, and certainly (for John) more extensive, than the famous Chester Beatty MS. of the gospels (which contains only a by no means continuous text of Jn 10⁷-11⁵⁷). So far as the facsimile of the first sheet goes, the text contains few surprises, but its witness on all doubtful points will be awaited with great interest. As soon as possible after the papyrus is published, THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will contain a critical discussion of it, and of its text, by Dr. C. K. Barrett.

Expository Problems

The Purpose of the Parables: A Re-Examination of St. Mark iv. 10-12

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR-EMERITUS W. MANSON, D.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

CHAPTER 4 of St. Mark's Gospel records a number of parables which Jesus, speaking from a boat on the Galilean Lake, addressed to a thronged audience on the shore. The chapter is a construction. After the Parable of the Sower, which begins and ends with words inviting attention, there occurs an interruption: an inner circle of disciples puts to Jesus the question of 'the parables.' As this is said to have taken place when Jesus was alone (4¹⁰), whereas in the rest of the chapter He is publicly engaged with His lake-shore audience, it would appear that the episode Mk 4¹⁰⁻¹² represents an insertion into the record, at this point, of material from another context. In fact in this chapter of Mark it is usual to distinguish three strata of source-tradition: one consisting of parables, another supplying an 'interpretation' of the story of the Sower (4¹³⁻²⁰), a third represented by the disciples' question and our Lord's answer. As it is with this question and answer we are to be engaged in the present inquiry, the primary task must be to determine whether the tradition here recorded embodies authentic language of Jesus and, if so, what its meaning was.

I

The statement that it was an inner group of disciples who raised with Jesus the question of the parables suggests that in St. Mark's time obscurity had fallen over certain elements in the tradition at this point, and the teachers of the Church were concerned to dispel the perplexity. A generation had passed since Jesus had proclaimed the Kingdom of God as not merely impending but as already actualizing itself in His word and work. He had used the analogies of the seed sown in the ground and the lamp brought into the room, but what did these figures of speech, each with its Old Testament *aura*, signify on His lips? Parables like the Seed Growing Secretly, the Mustard Seed and the Leaven had no appended moral, and in the Hellenistic Church this tempted to allegorization, while, as the variant Synoptic applications of the word show (Mk 4²¹, Lk 11³³, Mt 5¹⁵), the metaphor of

the lamp could be referred to subjects so diverse as the Person of Jesus, the content of His message, and the behaviour of His disciples. Scripture *testimonia* also could be cited which made speaking in parables equivalent to the utterance of *hidoth*, 'riddles' kept secret from the world's foundation (cf. Mt 13³⁵).

Moreover, in the tradition there were words of Jesus which spoke of His message as divinely concealed from the wise and as revealed only to children (Mt 11²⁵, Lk 10²¹) or only to the first generation of disciples (Mt 13¹⁶⁻¹⁷, Lk 10²³⁻²⁴). In addition, there had arisen in the Hellenistic Church by St. Mark's time a strain of theology which attributed Israel's rejection of Christ to Divine causation. The principal witness here was St. Paul who averred that, though the Jews had had the gospel of Jesus preached to them (Ro 10¹⁸), God had inflicted judicial blindness upon them, 'a spirit of stupor, eyes not to see and ears not to hear, down to this day' (Ro 11⁸). The same theology, quoting like St. Paul from Is 53¹ and 69⁹⁻¹⁰, was later to appear in the Fourth Gospel as the explanation of the incurable unbelief of the Jewish people (Jn 12³⁶⁻⁴¹). Indeed so strong was this current of thought in the Apostolic Church that in the judgment of many scholars no other origin need be sought for the saying attributed to Jesus in Mk 4¹¹⁻¹². The passage represents, as they consider, not Jesus but the Paulinism of St. Mark. This theory is not, however, as plausible as it looks. If the common tradition of the Church bore with it words of Jesus so indubitably authentic as those mentioned in the first sentence of this paragraph, there is no reason why the theology of Paul, John, and the Hellenistic Church should not have started from Jesus, and why utterances like Mk 4¹¹⁻¹² should not be genuine, though indeed their original *sense* has yet to be explored.

II

The Markan passage runs as follows: *When he was alone, those who were around him with the Twelve put to him the question of the parables. And*

he said to them : to you (disciples) the mystery (revealed secret) of the kingdom of God has been given, but to those outside (i.e., non-disciples, half-hearers, opponents) everything is in parables (i.e., is figuratively expressed and appears and remains enigmatical), in order (*ὥτα*). Jesus, employing words that recall the prophet Isaiah's commission, Is 6¹⁰, says that the purpose of the parables is) that seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not comprehend, lest (*μήποτε*) they turn and are forgiven.

Two things may here be affirmed regarding this Markan passage.

1. The text is ancient. The Isaiah quotation has features which align it neither with the Hebrew nor with the LXX text of Isaiah but (as T. W. Manson has shown) with the Aramaic Targum employed in Palestinian synagogues and with the Peshitta version. Whereas in Mark, as in the Targum and Peshitta, the closing phrase refers to forgiveness, in the Hebrew and LXX of Isaiah and in St. Matthew and St. John the reference is to healing. This gives the Markan tradition a definitely Palestinian background and suggests an early rather than a late date for its formation.

2. St. Mark's is the primary Synoptic version of the saying, for it exhibits the hardest features. Matthew has replaced Mark's 'in order that' by 'because,' thus making the parabolic teaching of Jesus an accommodation to the ignorance of the outsiders (Mt 13¹³). This softening is manifestly a secondary feature, as is also the Evangelist's expansion of the Isaiah quotation (13¹⁴⁻¹⁵) by which incidentally he has gone far towards cancelling out his own accommodation theory. Luke for his part has dropped Mark's 'lest they turn and are forgiven,' and has cut down Mark's 'that seeing they may see and not perceive,' etc. to the bare stump 'that seeing they may not see,' etc., thereby dismissing what, as I shall contend, is a cardinal feature of the Markan representation. But if Mark's is thus the basic Synoptic account, is its meaning that Jesus used His parables to conceal the truth, putting the people off with stories and precluding their conversion?

This interpretation is so repellent that not only Matthew and Luke but exegetes in every age have sought to extenuate its force. (Thus T. W. Manson proposes that in the original Aramaic a grammatical particle, standing for the relative pronoun 'who,' was, when translated into Greek, mistakenly given its alternative sense of *ὥτα*; what Jesus said was: 'Everything is in parables for those outside, who seeing see and do not perceive.') This, however, is conjectural, and is not Mark. Again, Vincent Taylor and Joachim Jeremias propose that the saying, though a genuine dominical word, did not originally refer to the parables but to the

teaching of Jesus in general. But this, too, is to abandon Mark who expressly links the word to the parabolic teaching, and may be trusted to have made sense of it as such, a sense not inconsistent with the parable he next reports: 'Does the lamp come in to be set under the bushel? . . . Is it not rather to be set on the lampstand?' (Mk 4²¹).

The same connexion of the word with the parables makes, in a different way, against those who, so far from finding the saying insupportable, welcome it as a veridical statement of the judgment-function of the Son of Man on earth. Taking their stand on the apostolic theology already mentioned they find no reason why Jesus should not intend to reserve the truth from the unreceptive. The objection to this is twofold. (1) Neither in Isaiah, nor in Paul or John is there any reference to parables being used. (2) Why should parables be the chosen means of vindicating the righteousness of God against the unbelieving? When we think of the simplicity, directness, human appeal, and exquisite art of the parables of Jesus, can we think of a really negative purpose being served?

The question therefore arises whether another interpretation is not possible, one which, while doing justice to the Evangelist's Greek, answers better to the situation of Jesus and to the character of His evangelical purpose.

III

The word about people having eyes to see but not perceiving recalls the Old Testament account of the prophet Isaiah's commission (Is 6¹⁻¹⁰). That commission emphasizes the obtuseness of the contemporary mind, which the prophet's teaching will only aggravate. He is to deliver his message, but its effect is to be negative: 'lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand . . . and turn, and be healed.' God intends His word by the prophet to be one of judgment. He says to Isaiah in effect: Go, and fail!

Jesus had the Isaiah passage in His mind, and He is conscious of fulfilling Isaiah's task. But does this fulfilment mean that He is to repeat Isaiah's experience? What does it mean for Jesus Christ to fulfil Isaiah or, for that part, to fulfil the law and the prophets? Merely to do what they did or—to prosper where they failed? Surely, as regards both Moses and Isaiah, allowance must be made for the sovereign freedom of the Messiah's action. God's servant (Is 42⁴) is not to fail or be discouraged.

Now nothing in Isaiah's commission is said about the use of parables, whereas the Jesus of St. Mark applies the Isaianic words expressly in that connexion. May not the use of parables be the new

thing by which the message of Jesus is to transcend the teaching methods of the prophets? Where Isaiah failed, Jesus by the adaptation of His message to the universal intelligence proposes to succeed. In that case He speaks in parables not to repel the many but to engage them, that what happened in Isaiah's case may never happen again.

IV

Such an *a priori* approach, which allows of a word spoken to a prophet becoming plastic to the mind of Jesus and receiving a meaning closely related to His function in *Heilsgeschichte*, is not incompatible with the Greek language of Mark. We are accustomed in reading the passage to lay the stress on the people's 'not perceiving' and their 'not comprehending,' whereas on closer scrutiny it may be found that the real emphasis is on their 'indeed seeing' and 'indeed hearing.' In the Hebrew language the use of the infinitive absolute to reinforce a verb has the effect of accentuating the notion or action or state denoted by the verb. In the LXX text of Is 6⁹ and in Mk 4¹² this Hebrew idiom is reproduced in Greek by the use of the participle in conjunction with the verb. Consequently the Markan word is patient of the meaning: 'that they may indeed [or surely] see and not perceive, and indeed [or surely] hear and not comprehend,' the emphasis falling on what comes to the people's eyes and ears. Further, the paratactic syntax is interesting. The paratactic structure native to Hebrew and other Semitic tongues admits of things being co-ordinated which in our more logical idiom would normally involve the use of main and subordinate clauses. For example, when our Lord says (Mt 11²⁵, Lk 10²¹): 'I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and understanding, and hast revealed them to children,' need it be supposed that the concealing of the truth from the one class and the disclosing of it to the other stand on an equal level of Divine intention as the paratactic syntax seems to suggest? Is not the actual meaning rather: 'I thank thee, Father, that while [or though] thou hast hid these things from the wise, thou hast revealed them to children'? Reverting to the Markan passage, can we not take the words analogously to mean: 'that they may indeed see, *though* they do not perceive, and indeed hear, *though* they do not comprehend'?

In that case, the final clause, 'lest (μήποτε) they turn and are forgiven,' will admit of being connected up with the part of the sentence which bears the accent, so as to yield the meaning: 'indeed see . . . and indeed hear . . . *in case* they yet turn and are forgiven.' μήποτε, on this construction, will embody the usage of μή in

cautious assertions, which Dr. Vincent Taylor does not think wrong, I think, to exclude. What the idiom expresses is a *still open possibility*: 'Is there a chance of their turning?' Implied answer: 'There is.'

On this understanding our Lord is not foreclosing the issue. Though non-disciples are at present blind to the spiritual meaning of His message, He will nevertheless by His parables lodge something in their minds which they can grasp and carry away with them. A picture will be set before their eyes. A story will be impressed on their imaginations. The seed will be planted in the ground. The Sower's word will prosper, it will not return to Him void. Something will get inside the door which mayhap will hold the door open to Jesus and eventually lead the non-disciples to conversion.

V

If the claim of this interpretation to a sympathetic hearing should be admitted, what results follow regarding Christian truth in general, and in particular regarding the use of the concrete illustration, the presentation of the truth in parables?

First, Christian truth, the revelation of God in Christ, comes to us on two levels of life.

Not first that which is spiritual but that which is natural; afterwards that which is spiritual
(1 Co 15⁴⁶).

If I have spoken to you of earthly things and you believe not, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things? (Jn 3¹²).

While we may not posit a natural theology, Nature and the structure of human life offer analogies to the redemptive order of God.

1. There were in the days of Jesus those to whom He was strange and alien, a Galilean visionary, a reputed wonder-worker, a preacher who at street-corners spoke about the Kingdom of Heaven and the coming of the Son of Man, but to whom they could lend no credence because His ideas differed from theirs. He would not share their nationalistic ambitions nor indulge their apocalyptic dreams. So they stood off from Jesus and remained 'outside' His counsel.

2. There was, on the other hand, the inner circle of disciples who had entered into personal relations with Jesus and had come under the power of His word, from whose eyes He had removed the scales, and to whom He becomes revealed as the Messiah. These were they who were in time to say: 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.' For this inner circle God's salvation has actualized itself in Jesus. The reign of God, once politically or apocalyptically envisaged, has revealed its spiritual meaning to their souls. Their

lives have come under its instant sign and claim. Without ceasing to be eschatological and transcendent the Kingdom has been interiorized. *Jesus has demythologized the Kingdom for this group, He has unveiled the mystery.*

So to-day, side by side with the committed Christians of the Church for whom the Kingdom of God has become identified with the Lordship of Christ, for whom life means being 'in Christ,' leaving Christ for the ground, the sphere, the substance, and the goal of life, there are in the world (and sometimes also in the Church) those to whom this higher realm of existence, experienced as the New Creation, remains inscrutable. For them Jesus Christ is, at the most, an ethical teacher or social idealist or religious mystic. They are prepared to listen to His teaching, though as they listen they keep a critical eye on the preacher, and give only a qualified attention to what he says. For such hearers Jesus is not, or not yet, Incarnate Redeemer, Word of the Father, Mediator with God, the Second Adam, our true life, the Overcomer of the world. What has Jesus Christ to offer on those two levels of existence?

To the first group, as we have seen, He offers the open 'mystery' of the Kingdom as centred in Himself, the demythologized Kingdom, the New Creation of human life in God. To the second group He offers His *parables*.

A final word, then, about the *matter* of the parables.

VI

The parables are not all and only for the non-disciples. Some are addressed to the Apostles, and not always understood by them; cf. Mk 7¹⁷⁻¹⁸ and again Mk 8¹⁷⁻¹⁸. Clearly Jesus used this instrument of teaching not *only* to call uncommitted hearers to attention but to interpret to engaged followers the nature of the life on which they have entered. Yet, by and large, the parables are pro-paedeutic, and fall into two types.

1. There is the recognizable group represented by the Sower, the Seed Growing Secretly, the Mustard Seed, the Leaven. Mostly the tradition introduces these in such forms as 'the kingdom of God is as if . . . ' or 'how shall we liken the kingdom of God?' Here the deliberate choice of analogy from the *natural world* is characteristic. In His wilderness temptation Jesus, revealed to Himself at His baptism as the beloved Son of God, had become exposed to Satanic solicitations that aimed to divert the course of His calling from nature to *super-nature*. Turn stones into bread! Give the people signs from heaven! Seize the promised Kingdom by the use of force! The naming of the Messiah at the Jordan had brought

the Power of Evil to its feet, and Jesus is allured to interpret His empire in terms not of the Divine but of the demonic order. May we not see in this group of parables His rejection of the demonic principle and His steady affirmation of the providential natural order as affording the true analogy to the energy of the Divine grace in redemption? It is significant that none of these parables speaks of stones being turned into bread, or of signs being given from the skies. Instead we have the analogy of the seed being sown in the ground, and of bread, harvest, and the Divine *synteleia* springing from the earth through the semination in it of a transcendent spiritual life. By contrast, the 'force' and 'forcers' alluded to in Mt 11¹² as aggressors of the Kingdom of Heaven are the powers of demonic disorder. In this way the gospel of Jesus and His use of parables stand in positive relation to the principle of the Incarnation. Jesus is on earth *Messias Absconditus*, not *Revelatus*, and His word to the many clothes itself accordingly in images drawn from lowly things on earth.

2. There is the mass of general parables deriving their symbolism from the variegated experience of *human life* in the home, the street, the market, the law-court, the vineyard, the shop, the wedding-feast and so forth. Here the method is by suggestion of the moral issues involved in the common intercourse of life between man and man, master and servant, debtor and creditor, rich and poor, wise and foolish, to focus at one particular point the bearing of the existential claim of God on men. Take, for example, the Parable of the Good Samaritan. Here is a story through which the principle of mercy integral to God's will to bring in His Kingdom, and embodied in the incarnate life of Jesus, confronts the ordinary wayfarer on the roadside of life with power to shatter the complacency and self-defence which he has erected against the love of God. Here then, as also in such parables as the Rich Fool or Dives and Lazarus or the Guest without the Wedding Garment, Jesus stands and knocks at the common street-door of life, but leaves some truth with the inmates of the house which may lead eventually to the house being thrown open to Him: 'O fool, this night thy life is required back from thee. Whose then shall those things be which thou hast got in readiness?' So is it with him who lays up treasure for himself and is not rich towards God, or again, 'Friend, how didst thou come in here not having a wedding garment?'

If Jesus thus speaks in parables to the man in the crowd, evangelism has to begin on the same level and by the same methods but also with the same hope that the man who has been disturbed in his complacency will open his heart to God. For the only future of arrested man is God.

Literature

THE SECT OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Books on the Dead Sea Scrolls are pouring from the presses of the world at an alarming rate, and eagerness to catch the ear of the public gives many of them a sensational flavour that serious study does not justify. One of the latest of these books is by the Princeton Professor, Charles T. Fritsch—*The Qumrān Community: Its History and Scrolls* (Macmillan, New York; 23s. net). Professor Fritsch writes a simple, and in general reliable, account of the finding of the Scrolls and of their content and character, until he comes to the last chapter, when he throws judgment to the winds and offers a misleading, because quite unbalanced, picture.

He begins with the story of the excavations at Khirbet Qumrān, and follows this by an account of the history of the Qumrān Community, as he reconstructs it, and only then offers an account of the caves and the manuscripts, on which any satisfying reconstruction of the history must be in part based. There follows an account of the finds at Khirbet Mird and Murrabba'at, which have no relation to the Qumrān Community, so far as can yet be seen, and which Professor Fritsch leaves out of account in the rest of the book. The remaining chapters consider the Qumrān Community in relation to the manuscripts, to the Damascus sect, to the Essenes, and to the New Testament. The similarities and the differences between the sect of the Scrolls and the Damascus Covenanters are pointed out with complete fairness, and while the sect is thought to be an Essene group, this is held with some reserve.

Professor Fritsch says that most scholars hold that the Habakkuk Commentary, which tells of the conflict of the Teacher of Righteousness with the Wicked Priest, deals with the period immediately before 63 B.C. It is always a temptation to a writer to claim that the view he espouses is the dominant one, and it may be agreed that a number of scholars have taken this view. It may even be that more scholars adopt this view than any other one view. It is doubtful if they outnumber the adherents of all other views, and certain that it is not established by merely counting heads.

The foundation of the Qumrān centre is assigned to the period of John Hyrcanus I (135–104 B.C.), and the migration to Damascus in the Spring of 31 B.C. As the Damascus Document looks back on the death of the Teacher of Righteousness but forward to a time forty years after his death, this would be consistent with the view that the Teacher of Righteousness died shortly before 63 B.C. But it would assign to him a very long period of leadership of the sect. For it is improbable that the

Qumrān centre was established before the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness began, since the Damascus Document tells us that they who constituted 'the root of Israel and Aaron' groped in darkness for twenty years until God raised up the Teacher of Righteousness. Their organization and the building of the centre which served them for so long is not likely, therefore, to have preceded his rise. It is a little surprising that no incident of his life appears to be referred to, save his conflict with the Wicked Priest at the end of his life, if he were the leader of the sect for half a century or more.

Some writers have taken the view that the migration to Damascus is a figurative way of referring to the migration to Qumrān. Professor Fritsch refers in a footnote to one of these writers, but refrains from indicating his view. If this view were sound, then the work of the Teacher of Righteousness would have to be placed in the second century B.C., since it preceded the migration to Damascus, and the foundation of the Qumrān centre is dated on archaeological grounds in the latter part of the second century B.C. The present writer does not identify himself with the interpretation of Damascus as Qumrān, and is not sure that the date of the foundation of the Qumrān centre can be determined on the ground of the oldest coins found there. He has, however, argued on quite other grounds that the Teacher of Righteousness belonged to the earlier part of the second century B.C. He sees no reason to place the migration to Damascus in 31 B.C. Professor Fritsch attributes this to two causes, an earthquake which damaged the centre at that time, and the supposed hostility of Herod. Of the hostility of Herod to the sect we have no evidence, save the statement of Josephus that Herod held the Essenes in high regard! Professor Fritsch sets this aside as unreliable, though he appears to regard the evidence of Josephus on the Essenes as in other respects reliable. There is, indeed, evidence that the Qumrān centre was abandoned for a time, probably following the earthquake, but none to associate this with any persecution at the hand of Herod, and none to connect it with the migration to Damascus.

It is the last chapter of the book which raises most questions, however. Professor Fritsch emphasizes a number of supposed links with the New Testament and sees similarity where only contrast is apparent. John the Baptist is held to have been probably a member of the Qumrān sect before he began his ministry, and it is supposed that his followers carried on a tradition derived from the sect, and that this was passed on to the author of the Fourth Gospel through the group with whom

Apollos was found. Curiously enough, Professor Fritsch supposes also that Jesus was profoundly influenced by the Qumrān sect, and if that were so it would not seem necessary to bring in Apollos as the channel of Qumrān influence on the New Testament.

The prophetic character of the ministry of Jesus is traced to the Teacher of Righteousness. This is without the slightest foundation, and it might have occurred to Professor Fritsch that whereas we have no evidence that Jesus had read the Dead Sea Scrolls we have considerable evidence that He was familiar with the Old Testament, and that a prophetic ministry could have been inspired by the prophets!

The choice of twelve disciples is thought to have a significant connexion with the nine laymen and three priests who formed the council of the Qumrān community. No evidence is offered that the inner three, Peter, James and John, were in any sense priests. The Last Supper is connected with the communal meal of the sect, which is described as a Messianic banquet. Professor Fritsch recognizes that the communal meal, which he describes on the basis of our knowledge of the Essenes and of the Qumrān sect, took place twice a day. There is no evidence that the Last Supper was something which had been repeated twice daily, and none that the communal meals of the sect had any connexion whatever with the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. Professor Fritsch refers to the text which says that the priest should stretch forth his hand to bless the bread and wine in the meals of the sect, but omits to observe that the lay Anointed One was declared to be entitled to partake only after the priest. If this had formed the analogy for our Lord, then He, the Davidic Messiah, should have partaken only after one of the three 'priests' had blessed and partaken. In short, both in form and in significance the Last Supper differs far more notably from the meals of the sect than it resembles them.

It would be easy to continue. The daily ritual bath of the Essenes before they partook of their communal meal is linked vaguely with Christian baptism through the baptism of John, with which it had nothing whatever to do. Jesus defended His disciples for eating without even washing their hands, and there is no evidence that Christians at any time demanded a daily baptism, or even a baptism before every Eucharistic meal. Christian baptism, like the baptism of John, was a rite of initiation, signifying a spiritual change, and it had behind it Jewish proselyte baptism. The lustrations of the sect were for purification from ritual defilement, and their background was the ritual lustrations of the Pentateuch.

It is unfortunate that Professor Fritsch has succumbed to the temptation to give a distorted

view, and to present similarities without any reference to real differences, and so to mislead his readers.

H. H. ROWLEY

THE MESSIANIC HOPE

A comprehensive book on the Messiah could hardly have been written until the controversy about 'divine,' or—as it is now more usual to call it—'sacral' kingship had shown signs of dying down. Such a book was written five years ago by Professor Sigmund Mowinckel of Oslo, and has now been translated by the Rev. G. W. Anderson, M.A., under the title *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism* (Blackwell; 45s. net).

A glance through the bibliography of well over six hundred items is sufficient to indicate that this book stands alone for range and comprehensiveness. The only work comparable with it is Gressmann's 'Der Messias' [1929], which was written before the kingship controversy really got going.

There are ten chapters, superbly documented. In this English edition shorter notes are at the foot of the pages, the longer 'Additional Notes' being printed together at the end (pp. 451-468). The main text of the book is not polemical, but the Notes are sometimes severe, and occasionally caustic. They may be passed over, at least on a first reading.

It is quite impossible to review the book in detail here; it must suffice to deal briefly with three main emphases.

On the question of the Israelite ideal of kingship, Mowinckel aligns himself with Frankfort, who showed that there were fundamental differences between the Egyptian and Mesopotamian conceptions of kingship. It is to Babylonian and Canaan that we must look for the antecedents of Old Testament kingship rather than to Egypt. Even so, there was always a tension between Canaanite and Israelite religion, not least in what concerned the kingship. Isolated expressions which may suggest that the king was 'divine' must be interpreted in the light of Israelite religion as a whole, in which Yahweh could brook no partners. Hence, expressions like that in Ps 110³, which Mowinckel interprets much as Widengren does, are to be regarded as literary or liturgical survivals rather than taken literally. As and where they now stand they are either a 'residuum' or have a new meaning.

The second longest chapter in the book is 'The Servant of the Lord' in Deutero-Isaiah. Mowinckel has travelled a good way since he first proposed (1921) that the Servant was Deutero-Isaiah himself. He is now prepared to grant that he may even be a purely future figure, though he thinks it most probable that he was an historical

individual, who lived some time after Deutero-Isaiah and died of leprosy. This is very like Duhm's 'leprous rabbi' theory over again. Mowinckel's justification for including a study of the Servant is that the Servant is important for any understanding of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. What strikes me most is his elucidation of the religious significance of the Servant conception.

The longest chapter in the book, 'The Son of Man,' is a treatise in itself. According to Mowinckel the origin of the conception is to be found neither in Dn 7 nor in the kingship ideology. Indeed, it cannot be explained from the Old Testament at all, but is derived from the widespread Oriental—originally Indo-Iranian—conception of 'the divine Primordial Man, "the God Anthropos," a figure of varying importance in a number of Hellenistic religions and religio-philosophical systems.' The Son of Man is to be distinguished from the first created man (Adam), though the two conceptions came to influence one another. Nor is he the Messiah, though he came in some Jewish circles to be more or less identified with the Messiah. Even so, the cosmological element in the conception was relegated almost completely into the background, and all the emphasis came to be laid on his soteriological and eschatological activity.

The concluding thesis of the book is that 'Jesus came to be, not the Messiah, but the Son of Man. He wanted to be the Messiah only in so far as the idea of the Messiah had been modified by, and was compatible with, that of the Son of Man.' With this He joined an equal consciousness that He was the Suffering Servant. The paradox is that neither of these conceptions was originally Messianic. By laying such emphasis upon the Son of Man conception, Jesus 'hallowed those features in it which were of non-Jewish origin, and in fact attested that He was a saviour for both Jews and Gentiles, the fulfilment of the hope of all mankind.'

On this catholic note the book closes. Whether or not we agree with it in detail, it is one of the great Biblical-theological books of this century, indispensable for students of both Testaments.

Mr. Anderson is better qualified than any one to have undertaken the translation. For ten years he has been the intermediary between Scandinavian Biblical scholarship and English readers. His translation is excellent. He has checked and where necessary corrected the many hundreds of references. He has earned the gratitude of his colleagues.

C. R. NORTH

HONOURING BARTH

Essays in Christology for Karl Barth, ed. by T. H. L. Parker (Lutterworth Press; 25s. net) is a volume well worthy of the purpose for which it was

written—to do honour to a great theologian on his seventieth birthday. Of its thirteen contributors, seven are Presbyterians, three Anglicans and three Congregationalists. All of them belong—or, according to the editor, belonged until recently—to the class of mortals vaguely described as 'younger theologians,' and more than one of them has deservedly been called a 'distinguished younger theologian.' None of them would thank us for calling him a 'Barthian' even though in one or two cases at least we might feel the term appropriate; but all are united in admiration for Barth and in acknowledgment of a debt of gratitude to him for his work. They have been guided in their choice of theme very fittingly by his own constant insistence that there are no problems in theology which are not in the end Christocentric. In their several contributions they seek to understand and illumine a series of living theological issues from this point of view, beginning with an introductory essay (by T. F. Torrance) on the nature of Biblical and dogmatic theology, and concluding with a discussion (by D. M. Mackinnon) of the relation between theology and philosophy. The intervening eleven essays deal with a number of vital and interrelated topics such as the Old Testament witness to Christ, the Christology of the New Testament and the Creeds, the idea of Christ as the agent of Creation, the Atonement, the Holy Spirit, the Church, the Ecumenical Movement, the nature of the Christian life. Different readers will no doubt find different essays more particularly rewarding, but John Marsh's 'Christ in the Old Testament,' with its solution of the problem of typology, W. A. Whitehouse's opening up of the problem of 'Christ and Creation,' and D. M. Mackinnon's 'Christology and Philosophy' may well be thought to be of outstanding significance.

None of the contributors would be likely, of course, to claim that he had given a final account of his subject; that was not their aim, but they were concerned rather to illustrate the meaning and relevance of the Christological approach to theological problems. This they have done, for the most part, admirably, although not even J. M. Haïre's able 'Defence of Chalcedon' will convince every one that the Chalcedonian Definition is either as authoritative or as unambiguous as some of the essayists appear to assume. And while we must agree wholeheartedly with J. B. Torrance's plea in 'The Priesthood of Christ' that the Person and Work of our Lord belong together, it may be questioned whether the revival of terms like 'substitution' is calculated to clarify the subject, unless they are more adequately explained. But as one does not have to be a Barthian in order to appreciate the immense and immensely fruitful influence of his work, so one does not need to be wholly

critical of his admirers in order to commend theirs with enthusiasm. In a day when theological books are nothing if not expensive, this one can be said to be cheap at its price.

PHILIP S. WATSON

In its historical survey *Early Indian Religious Thought*, by Mr. P. D. Mehta (Luzac; 42s. net), ranges from pre-Vedic religious thought to the period of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. After a short reference to earlier tribal religion Mr. Mehta gives an interesting account of the Mediterranean people who founded the Indus Valley Civilization, recently the subject of much archaeological investigation in India. His description of the Vedic age is beautiful, and he ascribes more importance than is usually given to the Dravidian conquered over against their Aryan conquerors, notably in the origination of Brahman caste supremacy. And he traces illuminatingly the first beginnings of monotheism. He finds the Upanishads to be 'not a tidy garden,' but interprets the main spirit of their teaching, emphasizing monism rather than monotheism. For him Buddhism is pre-eminent in early religious thought, and he is rather rhapsodical in regard to Buddha himself, but convincingly shows that his ideal of Nirvāna is positive as well as negative. He is more critical as regards the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, and stresses its practicality.

The second part of the book—in essay form—is diffuse and sometimes not very clear, and its fundamental topic is the relations of religions to one another. There should, he thinks, be no attempt at conversion, but he does not show how we can at one and the same time be exhorted to do all the good possible to one another and yet feel no responsibility for the searching out and sharing with others the 'best' that can be discovered regarding Ultimate Reality. In general, the attitude of Buddhism clearly dominates his thought. Belief in a Personal God is only a stage on the way to a full realization of the Universal or Impersonal One, and no one should attempt to disturb another's faith in his particular manifestation of the Personal God. He rather overstates the idea that in religion reason is always inferior to realization. 'A funny little Atlas,' he says, 'is the knowledgeable man!' crushed by the mountains of knowledge he has accumulated, and yet not succeeding in his quest for the ultimate goal of the life of the spirit.

Modern Canterbury Pilgrims, ed. by the Dean of New York (Mowbray; 13s. 6d. net), consists of personal statements by twenty-three converts to the Anglican Communion. Most of them are Americans, for this is an English edition of an American book; but there are a few from this

side of the Atlantic, for instance Kathleen Bliss, D. R. Davies and W. G. Peck. Some reached Anglicanism from other denominations and some from no religious profession at all. In Dean Pike's statement there is an element of special pleading. Most of the contributors pass by the Protestant churches because they have lapsed from the Catholic faith into 'liberalism'; but the Dean is bold enough to contend that Anglicans, besides being more Catholic than other Catholics, are more Protestant than other Protestants in that, while the Anglican Church has followed a process of reformation all through its history, the Protestant churches are tied to their Reformation confessions of faith!!

Bible students are fortunate in the publication in English of Father L. H. Grollenberg's *Atlas of the Bible* (Nelson; 70s. net). The original work was published in Dutch in 1954, in French in 1955, and now has been translated into English by Joyce M. H. Reid, wife of the Professor of Romance Philology at Manchester, and supervised by Professor Rowley. There is a joint Foreword by Professors Albright and Rowley, and a Preface by Father de Vaux, the Director of the French School of Biblical and Archaeological Studies at Jerusalem. He is in charge of the work on the Dead Sea Scrolls. No work could have more authoritative and trustworthy sponsorship. It contains thirty-seven maps, some of them occupying a whole page (fourteen inches by ten), and those on the end-papers occupying a double page. The maps were prepared by Father A. van Deursen of Groningen, a Biblical geographer of repute. They give physical and political details, and a system of colours and overprinted legends makes the maps come alive and gives more information than any one could possibly expect. There are four hundred and eight photographs excellently produced, many of them taken by Father Grollenberg himself. The letterpress (there are a hundred and sixty-eight pages) contains first an account of the geographical setting, and then details of how the Biblical geographers and the excavators set to work, how they select the sites and how they proceed. Then we have a history of the Hebrews and of Palestine from the earliest times down to the Fall of Jerusalem. Errors in the original edition have been corrected. In the margins there are Biblical references and also numbers which refer the reader to the relevant maps. There is a full index of both place names and personal names.

The volume has been prepared with the greatest care at every stage. Every reader of the Bible will find the atlas most helpful, and, considering all that is provided and the excellence of the production, the price is extremely moderate.

The Church in Scotland in the Last Hundred Years¹

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

A HUNDRED years ago public worship in Presbyterian Scotland was still dominated by the reaction against Charles First's ill-advised attempt to impose a liturgy of the Anglican type on the Scottish Church. For many generations opposition to popery and prelacy seemed to involve the barest possible form of worship, and any suggestion of change aroused violent hostility. Symbolism was regarded as Roman and idolatrous; everything was subordinated to the sermon. Such reading of Scripture as might be included was unsystematic. There were generally only two items of praise—two metrical psalms, or possibly a psalm and a paraphrase—led by a precentor. The people remained seated while they sang, but they stood for the prayers, and the prayers were long, lacking in order, and sometimes, it would appear, lacking in seemliness. After the middle of the century, however, signs of a longing for a more fitting service began to be apparent. In 1856 Claremont United Presbyterian Church, Glasgow, introduced an organ into their new building and petitioned the Synod to sanction its use. The petition was refused, not so much on grounds of principle, as because it asked for an innovation likely to breed dispeace in the Church. That same year the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland passed an Act advising the reading of a portion of both Old and New Testaments at each diet of worship, and the following year Dr. Robert Lee, minister of Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, began there the changes which made him the champion of the movement for worship reform. For ten years controversy waxed furious over Lee's innovations—read prayers, organs, postures, responsive amens. It seemed as if drastic action would be taken against him by the Assembly of 1867, but that was forestalled by the paralytic stroke which ended his public career. Early in 1865, however, in a small room in Glasgow, there met three ministers, Cameron Lees of Paisley, Campbell of Eastwood, and Story of Rosneath, and the result was the formation of the Church Service Society, under

whose auspices in 1867 there appeared the first edition of the *Euchologion*, which in successive editions had an incalculable influence in making the normal service more rich and comprehensive, more orderly and reverent. Similar societies in due course appeared in the other two large Presbyterian Churches. In 1872 the U.P. Synod removed the ban on the use of instrumental music in public worship, and the Free Church followed in 1883, by which time all three Churches had advanced some way toward achieving a worthy hymn book. Thus the tide of reform continued to flow, and it may be affirmed that the conduct of worship by the minister has changed for the better in devotional enrichment, order and dignity, almost beyond recognition in these hundred years.

Linked with the movement for a more ordered and beautiful worship, yet distinguished from it, one may also mention what at the risk of some misunderstanding has been called the Scoto-Catholic movement associated with the Scottish Church Society, and with such names as James Cooper, John MacLeod of Govan, and H. J. Witherspoon. The number of those who have been members of that Society has never been large, and some of its views might not find general acceptance, but it may be affirmed that the movement has nevertheless been influential, with the result that many of its aims have come to be commonly accepted, for example, beauty and symbolism in church furnishing, observance of the Christian year, and the special observance of Christmas and Holy Week, more frequent Communion, a strong sense of the Church's continuity from the Apostles downwards, a readiness to learn from the Church of every age, and a willingness to contemplate closer relations with churches of the Episcopal order.

If the classic case in connexion with worship reform appeared in the Church of Scotland, it was the Free Church which produced the corresponding case in the matter of the Higher Criticism, the champion being Professor Robertson Smith. While the great Reformers took their stand on the Divine inspiration of Holy Scripture, they did not, despite occasional statements which might suggest otherwise, hold a theory of plenary verbal inerrancy.

¹ An Address delivered on 3rd October, 1956, during the Centenary Celebrations of Trinity College, Glasgow.

Their final authority was not Scripture, but the Holy Spirit speaking through Scripture, and they did not, therefore, identify the word of God with the letter of the Bible. It must be admitted, however, that in Scotland, as elsewhere, the Church rapidly fell away from the Reformers' insight, and, in fact, set up the infallible Book against the Roman infallible Church. It was the case of Robertson Smith which re-opened this question with Scottish churchmen, for with all his acceptance of modern views about the authorship, date and composition of the books of the Bible, that great scholar never ceased to assert that he held the Reformation doctrine of inspiration, and believed that in the Bible he found God speaking home to his heart and declaring His will for the salvation of sinners. Though in the end Smith was removed from his Chair in the Free Church College, Aberdeen, yet that was done in such a way that his views were not declared contrary to the Confession of Faith. Thus while he was the martyr of the cause of the Higher Criticism in Scotland, he, unlike most martyrs, had the satisfaction of knowing that his basic views were advancing to general acceptance. His trial brought forward again the Reformation doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture which had been obscured for generations and freed it from unnecessary association with an untenable doctrine of verbal inerrancy.

Prior to and independent of the Higher Criticism controversy, yet connected with it, was the long process by which the Church won relief from the burden of the over-minute and rigid Westminster Confession of Faith. That process can be traced back as far as the 'Marrow' controversy in the early 1720's, and notable landmarks in its development are to be found more than a hundred years later, such as the deposition of McLeod Campbell in the Church of Scotland, and in the Secession Church the suspension of James Morison, which led to the formation of the Evangelical Union. Within the century which we are surveying, that matter cropped up in the Sabbath controversy of the middle 'sixties, when Norman Macleod brought a whirlwind of abuse about his head with some of his statements about the Fourth Commandment. There were many other influences at work then and later to undermine the strictness of confessional orthodoxy. There were Darwin's *Origin of Species*, published in 1859, the novels of George MacDonald, the teaching of idealistic philosophy in the Universities—Edward Caird became Professor of Moral Philosophy in Glasgow in 1866—the Moody and Sankey proclamation of a gospel free to all sinners, besides the liberal theological teaching of men like John Tulloch and John Caird. It is not surprising, therefore, that many churchmen sought relief from the hyper-Calvinistic

doctrines of election and reprobation and limited atonement. It was the U.P. Church which took the initiative, not by revising the Confession of Faith, but by passing a Declaratory Act to interpret it. This Act, formally adopted in 1879, toned down, or, in effect, abandoned some of the sterner doctrines of the Confession, and granted liberty of opinion on points not entering into the substance of the faith. The Free Church, with a formidable conservative minority, particularly strong in the Highlands, did not pass a similar act till 1892, while the Established Church sought a like relief for scrupulous consciences by way of modifying or qualifying the formula of subscription to the Confession, not, however, without raising some questioning as to whether such changes were not forbidden by ancient statutes. Not till 1905 did the famous Clause 5 in the Churches (Scotland) Bill give the Church of Scotland parliamentary sanction for the alteration of the formula. Since the Free Church case of 1904 had raised the question of the relation of the Church to the Confession of Faith from a legal angle, it was inevitable that prior to the Union of 1929 steps should be taken to win the acknowledgment from Parliament that the Church of Scotland has the right to alter its subordinate standards and formulas of subscription, and, as we know, that was expressly admitted in the Articles declared legal by Parliament in 1921, and we are reminded of the fact in the Preamble and questions read at every ordination and induction in the Church to-day.

The glory of the Universal Church of Christ during twenty centuries is that while after every great advance it has suffered a period of recession, yet after each recession there has come a period of greater and more comprehensive advance. Decay followed by revival, that is the typical pattern of the Universal Church, and it would be surprising if on the small scale of Scotland and of the past century, we could not trace something of the same pattern. In this period we can point to two major revival movements. That which reached Scotland from Ulster in the summer of 1859 and continued to make itself manifest for two or three years following, was a movement with which the name of no single evangelist can be connected. There were quite a number of evangelists; many of them laymen, some men of education and position, and some from the working classes. The terroristic note, the wrath of God and judgment to come, may have been unduly strong at times, but one cannot decry the movement which, for example, contributed not a little to the successful Home Mission work in the Wynd district of Glasgow, and which produced among its converts such missionary Scots as James Chalmers of New Guinea, Mary Slessor of Calabar, and James Gilmour of Mongolia,

not to mention such outstanding figures elsewhere as Dr. Barnardo the philanthropist, Hugh Price Hughes the great Methodist leader, and Evan Hopkins, one of the early leaders of the Keswick movement. The second revival movement which stirred Scotland as a whole, was that under Moody and Sankey, especially their first visit in 1873-74. It was a movement which refreshed in Scotland the religious essentials, the love of God, the freeness of forgiveness, and did not neglect the Christian call to righteousness and philanthropy. Its appeal was especially strong to youths and young men, and its effects continued to be seen down to our own time—men in municipal politics, in philanthropic agencies and social endeavour, as well as in the churches, who were first aroused to the call of God in the service of their fellows by these evangelists from overseas. Nothing that has been seen in Scotland since has equalled these two revivals in moving the people profoundly. Yet generation after generation, by spectacular means and otherwise, God has laid His hand upon men and women, claiming them for Himself, changing them, sending them out in His service, and the call to evangelism in the widest sense is now accepted in Scotland by the Church as a whole, as it has not been for many a day.

It is often supposed that the Church in Scotland has only re-awakened to the social implications of the gospel within the present century, and especially since the First World War. That is to do our fathers an injustice. They may not have noticed that in 1848 Marx and Engels issued the Communist *Manifesto*, but many of them conceived of salvation in more than individualistic terms, and in terms of more than the suppression of drunkenness, clamant as that need was. Do you remember Thomas Guthrie and his campaign for the Ragged Schools? Do you know that the General Assembly of the Free Church in 1858 appointed a committee to 'inquire into the state of the dwellings of the working-classes throughout Scotland, with special reference to the existence and extension of the bothy system, the bearings of this on the morality of the people, and the best means of securing a remedy for existing evils'? That was when Keir Hardie was but a child of two years of age. The convener of that committee, whose annual reports from 1859 onwards attracted much notice, was James Begg, later the leader of the constitutional die-hards in the Free Church, but also a bold and far-seeing social reformer. There was social concern then, and there was social concern at the turn of the century; witness Dr. David Watson of St. Clement's, Glasgow, and the Scottish Christian Social Union which he founded in 1901. That Union educated public opinion, it helped to promote legislative reforms; and at the same time

as he was inspiring these efforts, Dr. Watson was taking a prominent part in the social work of the Church, formally begun in 1904 and still expanding.

We are apt to suppose that Church Extension is a problem of the twentieth century. It should correct our perspective to recall that between 1843 and 1929 something like five hundred parishes *quoad sacra* were erected in Scotland. Take one local example: Matthew Leishman of Govan writes in 1867, 'Add Hillhead; this will make twelve chapels now *quoad sacra* parish churches built since I came.' The Free Church was itself, from one point of view, a church extension effort, the most active period naturally being the years immediately following 1843. Never at any time, however, was this matter allowed to rest. For example, in the last twenty years of last century, 1879 to 1899, the three large Presbyterian Churches added to their strength two hundred and twenty-five congregations: the Church of Scotland a hundred and ten, the Free Church sixty-eight, the United Presbyterian Church forty-seven.

Closely related to Church Extension is the Home Mission. In that connexion one may mention the notably successful attempt of the Free Church in the 'fifties and 'sixties to tackle that most needy district of Glasgow known as 'The Wynds.' About the same time one finds Norman Macleod of the Barony with his special services for working people, where the pews were filled with workmen garbed as on week-days, and women bare-headed or with an old shawl over their heads, literally from 'the streets and lanes of the city.' Again in the 'eighties there was the notable Home Mission work of William Ross of Cowcaddens, which included what Ross called 'pioneer' missions, something like the slum posts of the Salvation Army.

Space fails me to tell of the advances in the work overseas during this period. There was tragedy at the beginning, for the first missionary of the Church of Scotland's Punjab Mission was murdered along with his wife and child in July 1857, within five months of his arrival, the only Scottish missionary martyred during the Indian Mutiny. That struggle, however, proved a stimulant to the imagination of folks at home, and the first shock had hardly passed before Christians in Scotland began to hear in it a new call to the Church. The result was the Rajputana Mission of the U.P. Church. That Church also joined the Irish Presbyterian Church in the work in Manchuria, whose heroic and colourful story is part of the heritage of the Chinese Church to-day. The greatest quickening of the imagination, however, came through the tale of the lonely white man dying on his knees in a grass hut in Central Africa, and his body being brought by his faithful followers

through toil and danger to the coast, to be buried eventually in Westminster Abbey. The challenge of Livingstone's concern for Africa together with the stimulus of the Moody and Sankey Revival at home, produced the Livingstonia and Blantyre Missions, and these have been Livingstone's truest memorials. The same may be said of the South Arabia Mission founded by the Hon. Ion Keith-Falconer, athlete, scholar and pioneer, who died after only six months service. The origin of the Church of Scotland's Kenya Mission is to be found in the vision of Sir William Mackinnon, founder of a trading company, who recognized his responsibility for the tribes with whom he traded, while the Scottish work on the Gold Coast came into being when the Government, removing the German missionaries in 1914, turned to the United Free Church as a source of help for the mission thus bereft of its leaders. Emphases in mission work overseas have changed not a little in these hundred years—the World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910, being a notable landmark—but the need and the response continue.

Space forbids me to trace the manifold aspects of that revolutionary change in Church life which is symbolized by the fact that nowadays the church hall is not only an indispensable adjunct of the church building, but is regarded by some as even more important. A hundred years ago church folk were content with the Sunday services together with a weekly prayer meeting, perhaps a choir practice and a Sabbath School that in many cases was only a semi-official agency of the congregation. Now we have organizations in abundance. Some of this change may be traced to Archibald Hamilton Charteris, whose statesman-like vision and perseverance is writ large not only in the organization of women's work in the Church, including the Woman's Guild, the Order of Deaconesses and the Deaconesses Hospital, but also in several other spheres. Other changes may be traced to a new emphasis on youth, whereby the Sunday School became an essential congregational agency and found its complement in club and uniformed organization, the pioneer there being the Boys' Brigade, founded in 1883.

A hundred years ago there were three main branches of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, in order of size the Church of Scotland, the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church. For the ten years beginning 1863 the matter of union between the two last mentioned was discussed, but the attempt was abandoned by the Free Church leaders when it became clear that the constitutional party was so strong and determined that the union could be achieved only at the cost of a considerable schism in the Free Church. This movement was resumed in the concluding years of the

century, and achieved its aim in 1900, when the United Free Church was brought into existence, but there was still a minority in the Free Church, especially strong in the Highlands, which stood out and succeeded on appeal to the House of Lords in getting a judgment to the effect that it was the legal Free Church and entitled to all the property that that Church had gathered. This minority was obviously too small to administer such a trust, and the State intervened to divide the property according to the needs and capacities of the two parties.

This case, however, had shown that even a free church must stand in a positive relation to the State, in the sense that to be secure in its freedom it must get the State to acknowledge that freedom. Patronage had been abolished by the Act of 1874, and though the bitterness engendered by the subsequent disestablishment campaign remained a barrier between the churches, yet men were now better able to distinguish between essentials and non-essentials, and to appreciate the fact that unity need not mean uniformity. With this change of atmosphere, the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church entered into 'unrestricted conference' in 1909, and in 1912 a memorandum was produced, largely the work of Christopher Nicolson Johnston, later Lord Sands, which pointed the way forward. What was aimed at was union on the basis of freedom from State control—the prime requirement of the U.F. Church—which freedom, it appeared, was not incompatible with that national recognition of religion which was what the Church of Scotland chiefly valued in its relation to the State. The outcome we all recall—the framing of the Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in matters spiritual, their presentation to Parliament in the form of a Bill which passed both Houses in 1921, the adoption of these articles by the majority of Presbyteries, which was completed in 1926, the Haldane Committee's scheme for dealing with the endowments of the Church of Scotland, the Act of 1925 which legalized the final financial settlement, and then, on the basis of all that, the Union of 1929 whereby, as most of us believe, there was achieved a Church of Scotland, united, national and free. This Church is ready to welcome, as was evident at the General Assembly of this present year, the separated brethren of the Scottish Presbyterian tradition, and is also ready to join with churches of other denominations in Scotland and beyond in that great ecumenical movement which has so wonderfully changed the ecclesiastical climate in the generation since the First World War, and is ready in the spirit of that movement to seek closer relations with the churches in closest geographical proximity.

Israel's Kings, Sacral and Otherwise¹

PROFESSOR W. STEWART McCULLOUGH, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, CANADA

PROFESSOR AUBREY R. JOHNSON, to whose publications all Old Testament scholars owe a considerable debt, has recently published another work dealing with Hebrew kingship, its title being *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (University of Wales Press [1955]).² It might not be inferred from this title that the book is largely concerned with the interpretation of 'two well-known groups of psalms, (i) the hymns which celebrate the Kingship of Yahweh, and (ii) the so-called royal psalms' (p. iii.). While some of the views put forward in this book will find ready acceptance even outside the Myth and Ritual School, it seems to the present writer that others demand very careful appraisal.

I

Let us first of all sketch Professor Johnson's main position.

1. *With Respect to the Person and Function of the King* (here the author seems to be thinking mostly of the Davidic line in Jerusalem). The king was installed in his office by anointing, hence the term 'anointed one' or 'messiah' was applied to him; it is suggested on the basis of 1 S 16¹³ ³ that he was the recipient of a special endowment of the Spirit of Yahweh. As a member of the Davidic family he was conscious of belonging to a house which enjoyed the particular interest of Yahweh (2 S 7⁴⁻¹⁷, Ps 89²⁰⁻³⁸). Indeed there are some indications that the king considered himself in some sense the 'son' of Yahweh (cf. 2 S 7¹⁴, Ps 27 89²⁷⁻²⁸), though Dr. Johnson assures us that this sonship 'is simply one of adoption' (p. 25). This may explain the sacrosanctity attributed to the royal person (cf. Ex 22²⁷, 1 K 21¹⁰). As head of the State he was expected to secure and maintain righteousness and justice, and he himself was subject to the laws of Yahweh. The welfare of the community depended upon the character and well-being of the Crown. As for the king's rôle

in Israel's religion, Professor Johnson avers, with other scholars, that the temple in Jerusalem was essentially a royal chapel. He claims that the king led 'his people in worship on important occasions in the national life' and that he superintended 'the organization of the cultus in all its aspects' (p. 12). The author concludes section I of his book as follows: 'We must beware of exaggerating the importance of the fact that in Israelite thought the Davidic king is potentially so closely related to God. Although, in theory at least, he may be on such intimate terms with Yahweh and powerfully subject to His influence, he is by nature a man; and, so far as his subjects are concerned, he is no more than *primus inter pares*' (p. 27).

2. *With Respect to Israel's Autumnal Festival*. Not much is known about the festival with which the Hebrews celebrated the end of the agricultural year. Its original name was 'Asiph' ('Ingathering'), but later it became known as *Sukhōth* ('Booths'). Apparently this was the time selected by Solomon to mark the dedication of the Temple (1 K 8²). Dr. Johnson claims that this occasion was a very important one in the Hebrew religious year. It 'found its focus in the worship of Yahweh as King and even, perhaps, the universal King' (p. 52). It had two rather distinct parts. One was a celebration, presumably in song, of Yahweh's great deeds of the past (His triumph over the primeval chaos, His creation of the world, etc.). The other was a ritual drama in which the leading actor was the Davidic king. This drama was basically eschatological for it pointed to the future. In it the kings of the earth united in an attempt to overthrow Israel. The Hebrew king suffered an initial humiliation; he was in fact 'a suffering servant' (p. 104), but this was a prelude to his restoration, brought about at dawn by Yahweh Himself. It is even conjectured that 'something like a baptismal scene within the confines of the spring Gihon may have been the focal point of this dramatic ritual' (p. 110). The king and the nation were thus delivered from the forces of darkness and death, and the king was enthroned on Mount Zion as Yahweh's viceregent on earth. This ritual was designed to foster the views that Israel was a brotherhood in covenant relationship with Yahweh, that 'Death' would be vanquished,

¹ A Reply from Professor Aubrey Johnson will appear next month.—*Editor*.

² Cf. A. R. Johnson, 'Divine Kingship and the Old Testament,' in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, lxii. [1950-51], 36-42.

³ All Old Testament references are to chapter and verses in the Hebrew text.

and that Yahweh's goal for Israel would be achieved, this latter embracing the establishment of a universal realm of peace and righteousness.

II

Let us now examine some of Dr. Johnson's points in more detail.

(1) *The Monarchy.* Professor Johnson has reminded us of what we may call the ideals behind the Hebrew monarchy. Such Psalms as 18, 45, 9, 101, whatever their origin, reflect the monarchical ideal which came to be associated with Israel's kings. It should not be assumed that this kingly standard was the sole possession of the rulers of Judah. It may have been cherished in Northern Israel as well.

The present writer, as he was reading Dr. Johnson's book, found himself asking, What has all this to do with the general picture of Israel's kings which we get from the Old Testament? For the idealized royalty of the book seemed curiously different from the kings of Jerusalem and Samaria as we meet them in the Old Testament records. The account of 'the ways of the king' in 1 S 8¹¹⁻¹⁸ indicates that in some respects a Hebrew ruler was just as despotic as any Gentile king, and this is confirmed by the reasons given in 1 K 12¹⁻¹⁵ for the defection of the northern tribes under Jeroboam. Further, despite the prestige which kingship had, these rulers whether in Jerusalem or in Samaria, were not infrequently the objects of prophetic rebukes (2 S 12, 1 K 11²⁹⁻³⁹ 16⁷ 20³⁵⁻⁴³ 21, 2 K 20¹⁶⁻¹⁹, Am 7¹⁰⁻¹³, Hos 5¹⁻⁷, Is 7¹⁰⁻¹⁷, Jer 22¹³⁻¹⁹). Moreover, the prophetic criticism of social injustice (Am 2⁶⁻⁸, Is 10¹⁻⁷ 5¹⁻⁷, etc.) was, on Professor Johnson's own views, an implicit condemnation of the monarchy which was supposed to secure justice within the realm. What relation the prophet's indictment of kings bore to the violence which periodically broke out in court circles is not clear. In Northern Israel such trouble was endemic, and in two hundred years no less than nine families held royal office, nearly always with violent beginnings. Jehu, one of the most ruthless of these northern revolutionaries, seems to have had no inhibitions about slaughtering two of Yahweh's anointed ones (Joram of Samaria and Ahaziah of Jerusalem), and he evidently considered his acts sanctioned by Elisha (2 K 9¹⁻¹⁰). Earlier Omri's treatment of the House of Baasha had been condoned by Jehu the prophet (1 K 16⁷). Down south in Judah, where there was more political stability, no less than four representatives of the House of David were murdered (Ahaziah, Jehoash, Amaziah, Amon), and once a queen mother, Athaliah, who should have known something of sacral kingship, planned to wipe out all

the living members of the House of David and almost succeeded in doing so (2 K 11¹⁻³).

The impression which the Old Testament leaves on the present writer is that the kings of both Jerusalem and Samaria were a mixed lot, not greatly different from those who wielded kingly power in other small states either in the ancient Near East or in mediæval Europe. We may hazard the view that as time passed, the rite of anointing became but a formality, a conventional seal marking the attainment of royal authority. If the king's person was thought to be in some way sacral, this was of no great moment, for it had little to do either with his life expectancy or with his moral and political behaviour. It may be significant that to no Hebrew king, except David, is attributed the possession of the spirit of Yahweh (1 S 16¹³, 2 S 23²). Probably such attribution, in the light of the performance of the kings in actual history, would have been felt an impiety.

(2) *The King as a Religious Leader.* If we can accept the Biblical accounts of David and Solomon as having a substantial basis in fact, we must allow that both of these kings officiated at certain times as religious leaders. David is said to have sacrificed (2 S 6¹³ 24²⁵) as did Solomon (1 K 3⁴⁻¹⁵). The same is said of Jeroboam (1 K 12³²). It was David who secured a site for the temple (2 S 24¹⁸⁻²⁵), and it remained for Solomon to erect the sacred structure (1 K 6-8) in which he himself sacrificed (1 K 8⁶²⁻⁶⁴ 9²⁵ 10⁵). The fact that the royal palace adjoined the temple lends some plausibility to the view that the latter was a kind of royal chapel.

Just what the king's rôle in the Jerusalem cultus was, or became, in the post-Solomonic age is not clear. It was natural that the king as titular head of the State should display an interest in the temple fabric and furnishings, and we learn of repairs and alterations being made under the direction of Jehoash (2 K 12¹⁻¹⁷), Ahaz (2 K 16¹⁰⁻¹⁶), Hezekiah (2 K 18⁴), and Josiah (2 K 22-23). It is therefore in keeping with the known circumstances that we should find in the Psalter the so-called 'royal psalms,' in which prayer is made for a reigning Hebrew king. It is almost universally recognized, at least where there is a monarchical political tradition, that the welfare of a state is bound up with the well-being of its governing prince, but prayer for such a person does not necessarily point to his having a sacral status. If an Israelite king enjoyed the distinctive cultic position which Dr. Johnson claims for him, it is strange that no echoes of this are found in the Law. While the latter reflects post-exilic thought and practice, every one agrees that it contains much pre-exilic material. Yet the only references in the Law to the monarchy are in Dt 17¹⁴⁻²⁰ 28³⁶,

and these make no allusion to the king's place in the temple ritual.

Whatever the king's rights in the temple, it is evident that the priests also had rights, and the history of man's religions indicates that priestly prerogatives are usually carefully guarded. Even in Solomon's time only priests seem to have had access to certain areas in the temple (1 K 8^{5-6, 10}). Jeroboam was presumably following precedent when he appointed priests for his sanctuary at Bethel (1 K 12³¹⁻³²), and possibly it was their descendants who were there in Amos' time (Am 7¹⁰). In the latter half of the ninth century a priest named Jehoiada had a leading part in securing the accession of the boy-king Jehoash to the throne of Jerusalem (2 K 11¹⁻¹²), and when repairs were made to the temple, it was through this same Jehoiada that the king's plans were executed. In the next century, in the reign of Ahaz, a priest named Urijah appears to have been in charge of temple affairs, and it was by his help that Ahaz introduced his new altar into the sacred precincts (2 K 16¹⁰⁻¹⁶). It is not until the time of Josiah that we have a reference to a *high* priest, Hilkiah. It was he who allegedly found the Book of the Law which inspired King Josiah's reforms (2 K 22-23).

Possibly the position of the king in Israel's cultus was not a static one. It may have varied from one generation to another, according to circumstances, according to priestly leadership, and most of all according to the personality of the sovereign. It is not improbable that in the early days of the Davidic House, the king was head of the cultus, and that in the course of time the influence of the priesthood considerably increased. 2 Chronicles 26¹⁶⁻²¹, with reference to Uzziah's leprosy, may be apocryphal, but at least it reflects the view that priests had rights in the temple which the king could not share. Moreover it should not be assumed that this priestly doctrine developed only in the post-exilic age. The troubled times of Ahaziah, Athaliah, and Jehoash (all three of whom were murdered) may have led in the ninth century to a diminution of royal rights in the temple. The likelihood of this is not lessened by the statement of 2 K 12¹⁻³ that Jehoash during his minority was tutored by Jehoiada the priest. The extent to which priestly influence can grow is illustrated in the post-exilic period. Judah started off in the Achaemenid era with both a civil governor as well as a high priest, but some generations later there was seemingly only a high priest who combined civil and sacerdotal functions in one person.

(3) *The House of David*. The historical fact is that one family supplied the rulers for Jerusalem from David's time until the early part of the sixth century B.C. As royal families go, this was quite a

performance, though there are parallels in the ancient Near East. The Sassanids of Persia lasted for over four hundred years until the rise of Islam, while the Achaemenids of Persia, the Ptolemies of Egypt, and the Seleucids of Syria each endured somewhat less than three hundred years. That David's line lasted as long as it did was due in part to the homogeneity of the people it ruled, and in part to the belief that this family was destined by Yahweh to rule forever in Jerusalem, a sentiment doubtless cultivated by all the interested parties (cf. 2 S 7 23⁵, Ps 89^{2-5, 20-38} 132 11-15).

The view that the House of David was selected by Yahweh to rule for ever in Jerusalem, even when the selection is qualified in some sense (cf. 1 K 2¹⁻⁴), can only be described as a political myth or an artful fabrication. Quite apart from the simple fact that Davidic kings ceased to rule in Jerusalem in the sixth century B.C., this Davidic House dogma rests on a parochial view of the nature and purposes of the God of Israel. It is instructive that it is found in the prophetic books only in those sections that are apocalyptic in character or are obvious interpolations (cf. Hos 3⁵, Is 9⁶, Jer 23⁵⁻⁶ 30⁹ 33¹⁴⁻²⁶, Ezk 34²³⁻²⁴ 37²⁴⁻²⁵). We may note that Jer 22³⁰ implies that Jehoiachin's sons will not succeed their father, and in fact this was the case. The non-moral direction in which this Davidic dogma leads is illustrated in Ps 89, which is a lament by or for a Judæan king. The speaker is quite oblivious of his share of responsibility for the disaster of which he complains, and his words are virtually a reproach directed to God for forgetting His promises to the royal house.

(4) *Israel's Autumnal Festival*. As Dr. Johnson recognizes, not much is actually known about this celebration. To use his own words, 'Unfortunately the Old Testament offers little direct evidence as to the ritual and mythology of this great autumnal festival in any of its forms; and even the little that is available is post-exilic in date' (p. 51). None the less our author proceeds to present us with an imaginative reconstruction of the cultic procedure.

There can be little quarrel with the view that in the autumn of the year there was a religious celebration of some sort in Israel. In an agricultural community this is what we should expect. Moreover the importance attached in the post-exilic period to certain days in the seventh month (cf. Lv 23²³⁻³⁶) suggests that this period of the year was of long-standing significance. Nor can we find fault with the supposition that during this feast the great powers of Yahweh (in primeval conflict, in creation, in history) were celebrated in song and dance. This affords a reasonable account of the origin of the so-called 'Enthronement of Yahweh'

psalms (47, 93, 96-99), and it is a considerable improvement over the earlier view, associated with the name of Mowinckel, that Yahweh was 'enthroned' annually on this occasion.

Professor Johnson avers that a feature of this festival was a recognition of the 'Kingship' of Yahweh, and he suggests that there is ground for believing that in the celebration of Yahweh as king we find an adaptation of the earlier worship carried out in pre-Israelite Jerusalem. It is of course impossible either to prove or to disprove such an assertion. It is a fact, however, that man has habitually transferred to his gods the terms of respect he uses for his fellow-man. The conception of kingship was a very old one in the ancient Near East, and for a Hebrew to call his God a 'king' must have been a most natural thing. The further extension of this practice to make Yahweh king of the world probably went hand in hand with the development of a practical monotheism. When this latter conception was arrived at is a moot point, but it may be doubted if it was in any way furthered by the Jebusite cult in Jerusalem.

A feature of the autumnal feast, according to Dr. Johnson (*et al*), was the enactment of a ritual drama. Of course all scholars are familiar with the place of cult and ritual in the ancient Near East, and *a priori* they would expect to find something of this same cultic pattern in the life of Israel. It has been relatively easy to see that the three main festivals of the Hebrew year (Passover, Weeks, and Booths) are adaptations, at least in part, of Canaanite practices, for there is much evidence as well as general probability pointing to such a conclusion. When it comes to a ritual drama it is a somewhat different matter, for even the members of the Myth and Ritual School must admit that no clearly discernible vestiges of such a drama have survived. The present writer has no presuppositions that would prevent him from subscribing to the view that Israel used religious drama, but it does seem to him that we should be wary about such a view until good evidence for it is presented. If this alleged drama was as splendid and wholesome a performance as Professor Johnson claims, it is strange that only a few poems from it, now included in the Psalms, have come down to us.

There are a few specific points in Dr. Johnson's argument which call for special comment: (a) That in Ps 48, particularly in vv. 5-9 there is evidence of a visual experience in the temple: the key verse is, 'As we have heard, so have we seen' (v. 9 [R.S.V.]). But we all know that the Hebrew verb 'to see' can have meanings other than 'to see with the eyes,' and if this is a pilgrim psalm, the meaning of the verse in question can be that whereas the psalmist had heard at home of

Yahweh's past exertions on behalf of Israel, his visit to the city corroborated what he had been told. Further, in v. 10, Dr. Johnson is at pains to render the word רָמִינוּ as 'we have pictured'; there is, however, substantial support for 'we have thought of' (Nu 33⁵⁶, Jg 20⁵, 2 S 21⁵, Ps 50²¹).

(b) That in Ps 89³⁹⁻⁵² we have, not the description of an historical situation, but an element in the drama wherein the king is humiliated prior to his 'salvation' by Yahweh. This interpretation seems to the present writer to rob the text of the basic sincerity we assume to lie behind it. Moreover, we might well ask, Supposing a Hebrew king were in a situation in which he wished to appeal to God for help, what would he say? And as for finding in this pseudo-suffering evidence that the king was a suffering servant, this would appear to be a mockery of the latter concept. A servant who did not in some real sense suffer would never have inspired the writing of Is 53, nor have prompted the Early Church to insert in the Creed, '... suffered under Pontius Pilate.'

(c) That Ps 110³ reflects a part of the ritual drama and that it deals 'with the rebirth of the Messiah, which, as we now know, takes place on this eventful day with his deliverance from the Underworld' (p. 121). 'Know' here is too strong a term: 'opine' or 'suppose' would be much more appropriate. Be that as it may, as every Hebraist is aware, the text of Ps 110³ is notoriously difficult, and to make such a text the principal basis for an impressive theory will command very little confidence in the theory. Professor Johnson suggests that one word in this verse, חַיִּל, be translated 'thy birth'; it should, if we are to use the derivation he proposes, be rendered 'thy writhing,' with a feminine antecedent for, when the verb חָלַהּ is used of childbirth, the subject is the mother (either literally or figuratively), and it has no reference to the offspring.

(d) That part of the purpose of the drama is to bring to the king and to the people generally the assurance that death will finally be overcome, death being conceived as a kind of arch-enemy of Yahweh. Professor Johnson admits that 'it is tempting to compare the story of Baal's conflict with Môt ('Death') in the mythology of the Ras Shamra tablets' (p. 81).

The suggestion that Yahweh is in conflict with death is foreign to the thought of Israel as represented in the Old Testament. Actually the Hebrews, like a good many people in our own time, do not seem to have been greatly troubled by death for it is obviously the lot of all men. It is only undesirable when it strikes prematurely, through sickness, disaster, or the machinations of enemies. It is from one of these ancillary agents that deliverance is usually sought in Israel's

prayers, it is not from 'death' as a part of the natural order of things.

Let us therefore examine three passages which Dr. Johnson cites in support of his position :

- (i) Our God is a God of salvation ;
and to God, the Lord, belongs escape from death (Ps 68²¹ [R.S.V.]).

Dr. Johnson renders the last line,

- 'And through Yahweh, the Lord, "Death" is expelled' (p. 73).

These words, however, are probably to be interpreted as expressing the faith that Israel's God can save the nation, and when its extinction seems imminent, He will bring about deliverance.

- (ii) that this is God,
our God for ever and ever.
He will be our guide for ever.
(Ps 48¹⁶ [R.S.V.]).

The last line according to Dr. Johnson is,

- 'Is our leader against "Death"' (p. 81).

The last two words in this verse have long been recognized as a *crux interpretum*. Since Ps 48 is apparently a pilgrim song, and since it betrays no interest in or anxiety about man's mortality, the R.S.V.'s rendition of the last line is probably the best way of taking an uncertain text.

- (iii) The cords of death encompassed me,
the torrents of perdition assailed me ;

the cords of Sheol entangled me,
the snares of death confronted me.
In my distress I called upon the Lord ;
to my God I cried for help.

(Ps 18 5-7a [R.S.V.])

Psalm 18 is usually taken to be a thanksgiving poem, written or adapted for royal use. The verses quoted above indicate that the speaker had been on the point of death, and as the rest of the psalm shows help presently came from Yahweh Himself. Appeals to God for succour in the face of death, or thanksgivings for deliverance from death, are common in the Psalter (Ps 65-6 9¹⁴ 13⁴ 22¹⁵⁻¹⁶ 30⁴ 33¹⁹, etc.), and there is no valid reason for treating the above verses of Ps 18 as being in a different category. Dr. Johnson, however, takes these verses as being a description of the king's 'disastrous experience' in 'the ritual combat,' the latter being with the 'arch-enemy "Death"' (p. 108).

The conclusion of the matter is that if we are to be asked to believe that in the ritual of the autumnal feast 'Death' was vanquished, we surely have the right to ask for more convincing evidence than Dr. Johnson supplies. Quite apart from such a consideration, what a meaningless mumbo jumbo it must have been, if year after year the king went through this drama wherein death was supposedly nullified, or the hope was held out that death would eventually be ended. Yet Hebrews continued to die and descend into Sheol as had their fathers, and there was still no hope of a resurrection. If such a ritual drama did once exist, we can well understand why, as religious insight deepened, it should have fallen into disuse.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Snag Sheets

BY THE REVEREND THEO. F. VALENTINE, M.A.,
LONDON

'If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us.'—1 Jn 1⁹.

It was along the very beautifully finished and streamlined fuselage of a new untested aircraft that I met my first 'snag sheets.' We had been right through an aircraft factory and had watched men making planes from the tail to the nose ; had come right through until we reached the final testing hangar from which the planes go out on their first test flights. In actual fact we went beyond that, for we were taken to the control

tower of the airfield to watch different craft take off and land during trials. It wasn't one of the very biggest of factories and we were therefore able to ask a lot of questions.

It was most interesting to watch all kinds of processes like metal—rather 'skin'—being softened and either blocked, pressed or cut into the right shape. As we went along we were able to pick up the different coloured rivets which are used to 'stitch' the 'skin' together ; there are thousands and thousands to one aircraft. The rivetters often work in pairs—one inside and the other outside—and it takes quite a time for the two to work smoothly and quickly together without seeing each other. Many of these two-man teams have been together for many years. But we must go back to that streamlined fuselage.

This aircraft had grown up through the factory

and had reached the final shed; it looked sleek, fast and powerful—it was the result of many men's labours. At this stage everything right through the aircraft is given a very thorough and complete test. When anything is found that is imperfect or below standard down it goes for attention on the 'snag sheet' and workers are called to put these things right. I counted on this particular aircraft nine sheets—and some had been subdivided. When the 'snag' has been put right the workman must actually sign his name to say the work has been done. 'Snag sheets' are not very popular!

What a good idea it would be if at the end of every day we did something like this. I mean if we looked back over all the happenings of the day, all the little details, and remembered what would have been the perfect will of God for us in all of them. I think we would have 'snag sheets' too.

When you go to bed and say your prayers, it is so easy to fall into a habit of just repeating the Lord's Prayer, or of using a vague phrase such as: 'Forgive me, O Lord, if I have done wrong this day.' This just is not good enough. It is far better to sit quietly for a minute, check up on what has actually happened, jot the mistakes and imperfections down on your 'snag sheet' and confess them in detail to God. Forgiveness then is going to mean much more to you.

Before you start your 'snag sheet' you could use this verse of a hymn as a prayer:

Show me myself, O holy Lord;
Help me to look within;
I will not turn me from the sight
Of all my sin.

Doing the Hard Thing

BY THE REVEREND J. ITHEL JONES, M.A., B.D.,
LONDON

'Endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.'
—2 Ti 2³.

A little girl I know has an answer for everything. One day her teacher found that Anne, instead of working hard at her sums, was quite calmly copying the answers from her little friend Mark. Well, of course, that kind of thing just couldn't go on. And so the teacher asked Anne what she thought she was doing! 'Well,' retorted Anne, 'it's like this, Miss. I'm not very good at sums and Mark is very clumsy at tying shoelaces. So I tie his laces and he lets me copy his sums!'

Fair enough? Well, for grown-ups perhaps that kind of thing is all right. Each of us does the job he is best able to do. What would happen,

for instance, if I tried to make my own shoes instead of getting them from experienced shoemakers? What if I started tinkering with my wireless when it goes wrong, instead of calling in an electrician? And suppose every time I wanted to light a fire I had to go down the mine and dig for coal?

No; we leave these special jobs to the people who are trained to do them and we get on with our own job. In this way we all fit into the picture of life.

That is the secret of the Church, St. Paul tells us. He calls the Church the body of Christ. And as the body has many parts—'members' as he calls them, each one doing its own job—the eye doing the seeing, the ear the hearing, the nose the smelling, and so on, so it is with the Church. Each member does what God has put him there to do. In that case it's each man to his job.

All the same, Anne was wrong. When we are children we need to get down to doing the things we don't like and things we are not good at. It puts toughness into our character. And no man can be a Christian in a world like this without some of that toughness. For we are called upon to 'endure hardness' as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. So Anne had better get down to her sums and Mark to his shoelaces.

The Christian Year

SEXAGESIMA

The Voice of God

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL NORMAN H. SNAITH,
D.D., WESLEY COLLEGE, HEADINGLEY, LEEDS

'And God said.'—Gn 1³.

Isaiah the prophet went to King Ahaz and bade him ask for a sign from God. Ahaz refused; he did not want a sign. But Isaiah replied that Ahaz was going to have a sign whether he wanted it or not. The sign was, you remember: 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel' (Is 7¹⁴). But why did Ahaz do his best to avoid the sign? It was because he believed, as everybody believed then, that the sign would be effective, that when once the sign had been given, the rest followed inevitably. It would not be simply an illustration in a speech, nor would it be a saying or an incident from which the prophet would proceed to point the moral. It would be the actual beginning of the happening itself. It would be an *effective* sign, a *magic* sign, in the sense in which the word 'magic' is used in the study of primitive religion, a sign which belonged so closely to the subsequent

action that the two can be classed as one operation. In this sense of immediacy, the signs of the Bible are the initiation in this world of the determined deeds of God. The evident act of God begins with the sign. It is a magic sign.

This is true of the Word of God. When the prophet speaks, it is the Voice of God. He speaks the Word of God, and not his own word. If it had been his own word, it would have been no more than a pious hope, a human guess, or at most the considered judgment of a wise, good man. But since it was the Word of God it was therefore an effective word. The very speaking of the Word forthwith set in motion irreversibly the veritable act of God. Nothing could prevent that act of God. It was not going to be: it was here. 'He spoke, and it came to be' (Ps 33⁹, R.S.V.). The Voice of God, made to be heard through the prophet, was so immediately active that there was no slightest interval between the saying and the doing. The Word itself is the act. The prophet prefaced what he had to say with the formula: 'Thus saith the Lord.' This phrase is not only an impressive opening for the oracle; it is the magic formula which ensures life and actuality to the oracle. As soon as the formula has been uttered, the Divine act is in being. It is in process of being accomplished.

1. *The Creative Voice of God.* 'And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.' At the instant Voice of God, light forthwith sprang into being. 'And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters,' and immediately there was a cleaving of the waters above from the waters below. It was all 'immediately, if not sooner.' 'The Voice of God is powerful . . . the Voice of God cleaveth the flames of fire . . . the Voice of God strippeth the forests bare' (Ps 29). One moment the cedars of Lebanon are rich with luxurious green, the next moment they are stripped bare like the relics of a forest fire—stark naked, desolate. So effective is the Voice of God that psalmists and prophets speak of the Word of God almost as if the Word itself were a living, active agent of God. 'He sendeth his word, and healeth them. And delivereth them from their destructions' (Ps 107²⁰). Similarly the absolute effectiveness of the Word of God is likened in Is 55¹¹ to the inevitable and regular course of Nature, the processes of growth and the remorseless cycle of the seasons: 'So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.'

2. *The Redemptive Voice of God.* It has often been pointed out that the beginning of the Gospel according to St. John is closely linked in phrase-

ology with the beginning of Genesis. This applies not only to the initial phrase 'In the beginning,' but also to the idea of the Word of God. The link is closer than is generally realized. It includes the idea of light. Jesus is the Word of God. Scholars mostly think here in terms of the Greek Logos (Word), that indwelling reason which holds the world together and in which all things cohere, that rational principle of the universe, that essence which makes man one with the world and at the same time in some sense kin with God. All this is doubtless true, but if we remember the close association with the first chapter of Genesis, we can see that the Evangelist is saying more than ever the Greeks could say. He is speaking of the direct and immediate action of God. Just as in the beginning of creation God spake and forthwith there was light, so now once again God has spoken and has given the Light to men. When the Word became flesh, God was once more taking the first step in a new action, the saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ. At the first beginning, 'the first Adam became a living human being'; at the second beginning, 'the last Adam became a life-giving spirit.' 'The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is of heaven.' From Bethlehem through to Calvary there is a Divine necessity, a determined Voice of God that cannot be denied, the Word of God which cannot return to Him void. The word of atonement was spoken; the work of atonement was done. With us, the word and the work are separate. With God the Word and the Work are one. We speak and often do not act. He speaks and already it is done.

3. *The Elective Voice of God.* Here we speak of the Voice of the Holy Spirit. With St. Paul 'called' means 'chosen, elected.' This is because he was so fully aware in his own experience of the immediate and compelling power of the Voice of God. When once a man hears the Voice of God, his fate is fixed. Henceforth he is God's man, 'a chosen vessel' unto God, 'the slave of God.' He comes to realize as the years pass by that the choice was God's and not his; and this is in spite of the fact that at the time of his conversion he was conscious mainly that he himself was choosing. But the older a man grows in Christian experience, the more he 'grows up' in Christ, the more he becomes conscious of the effectiveness of the Voice of God. It is this consciousness of the *effective* Work of the Holy Spirit that is the real treasure of Christian experience. 'I was an herdman . . . the Lord took me . . . the Lord said,' and Amos had no alternative. And so it always is. God speaks in creation and it is done. God speaks in Christ and it is done. God speaks to a man, and it is done.

But is it done? Does the Voice of God come to every man? And if so, why do some turn back to Him, and so many turn away? It is because men's ears are dulled from hearing, dulled because of sin, because of self, because of pride. And we, who know something of His saving grace, must speak more persistently, act more consistently, so that both by word and by work men may listen, and listening, hear the Voice of God that will not be denied.

QUINQUAGESIMA

Savourless Salt

By THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., EDINBURGH

'And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain . . . And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, . . . Ye are the salt of the earth.'—Mt 5^{1-2, 13}.

'What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way? But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest. . . . Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another.'—Mk 9^{33, 34, 50}.

'Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple. Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned?'—Lk 14^{33, 34}.

The setting of the sayings of Jesus in the Gospels is of paramount importance for it is the setting that gives the clue to their precise meaning. The evangelists Matthew, Mark and Luke place the bulk of Jesus' sayings in the same setting, revealing that they interpret them in exactly the same way; but, there are a few sayings of the Master which they put in different settings, betokening that they interpret them in different ways. This saying of Jesus about savourless salt is one of those which each evangelist places in a different setting. That is to say, each interprets it in a different way.

Salt, pointed out Jesus to an audience during His Galilean ministry, is a priceless commodity. It possesses a certain savour or tang: but, let salt get a touch of strong sun or rain and it immediately loses that vital quality and so becomes of no value to man. What precisely did Jesus mean by this saying of savourless salt?

1. If we turn to St. Matthew's Gospel, and look at the setting in which he places it, we find that his interpretation of the saying is, that it is the Christian Church which prevents the total moral corruption of this world.

In the year 1650 the inhabitants of Norwich petitioned Parliament for permission to demolish that altogether useless building, the Cathedral, and

to use its stones for the repairing of the pier and the building of a workhouse. Is that not how many in our day regard the Church? What, they ask, has it done to avert the Suez crisis, or settle the Cyprus issue, or to prevent strikes in industry? In their view it is an ornamental institution which accomplishes nothing of real moment in this tortured world. But, is this really the case? Read that sentimental play *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*, and we find a mysterious stranger comes to stay in a broken-down London boarding-house where all sorts of seamy things are going on. He does not succeed in transforming the place into a house of saints as he would like to do, but he does arrest the moral deterioration which has set in. This is precisely what the Church is doing in the modern world. She is not eliminating injustice, barbarity, class hatred and the hundred ills which make our social life to fester; but she is holding these things in check. She is preventing them from completely engulfing the world, and thus allowing some decency to prevail. Who can deny that this is a tremendous thing? Enquire of any who have escaped from a concentration camp or a Communist dominated country into a country whose political institutions are 'free' because of Christian influences which have shaped them, and they will tell you that the difference is one between life and death.

This, apparently, is Matthew's interpretation of Jesus' saying about savourless salt, for regard the setting in which he places it. The evangelist pictures the Master speaking to His followers on a hill overlooking Galilee. There, in the fishing village below, the fishermen were busy packing their catches into boxes for transport. As they did so, a brawny fisherman threw handfuls of salt among the fish to prevent decay and to preserve their good qualities. Always with a quick eye for a telling text Jesus pointed to the fishermen engaged in their task and said to His followers, 'Ye are the salt of the earth.' Just as that salt prevents corruption among fish, so you of the Christian Church, whatever your faults, prevent the total moral corruption of this world and allow some decency to prevail.

2. Next, turn to St. Mark's Gospel. If we consider the setting in which he places this saying about savourless salt we discover that his interpretation of it is, that it is of paramount importance that we in the Christian Church should live in concord and peace with one another.

Once I was asked by a doctor to see a saintly little widow woman who had completely broken down and for whom he could find no cure. When her complete confidence had been won, the source of her trouble was soon revealed. A brother and sister stayed with her and for ten years neither had

spoken to the other—not even at meal times. The strain of trying to reconcile two of her own family circle proved too much for her and ended in collapse. This kind of thing is more common in the Church than we are prepared to admit. There is not a congregation in which you will not find people who have quarrelled and are estranged; people who have a grudge against a fellow-member and are nursing it; people who take a delight in intriguing against some one who has crossed their path. All such people need to be told to read Paul's passage in Corinthians on the Lord's Supper and to have brought home to them that such dissension in the Church is of gravest import. It is lack of peace and concord which ruins the Church's fellowship, drives people to seek true brotherhood outside the Church, makes the Church unheeded when it calls on the nations to live at peace, and brings upon the Church the judgment of God.

That, it would seem, is Mark's interpretation of this saying of Jesus about savourless salt. The evangelist pictures two men who have quarrelled violently, and, seeing the folly of it, have decided to end their estrangement. How is it to be done? In the East men express their friendship towards each other by sharing a meal. Mark visualises the two former enemies seated at a common board and in the centre of the table stands the salt cellar—the symbol of hospitality and friendship. As these two men ended their quarrel by sharing salt so let there be no mistake about the urgency for all within the Church to live in concord and peace.

3. If we turn to St. Luke's Gospel, we find that the setting in which he puts this saying of Jesus makes it clear that his interpretation of it is, that the utmost self-sacrifice is required of us all in the Christian Church.

Dr. McIntyre avers in his Warrack Lectures that there was a time when the Christian ministry had the best expectation of life of all the professions, but that day has now gone. It is the most demanding and punishing of vocations, with conscientious ministers working as much as seventy hours a week in the cure of souls. This reveals, on the one hand, how desperately hard it is to make a Christian out of any man in this scientific, materialistic, humanistic age: and, on the other hand, it brings home that to win any person for the Christian Faith demands self-sacrifice of the highest order. There was Professor Gossip, who lost his wife when she was in the full flower of her womanhood. He preached his famous sermon, 'When life tumbles in, what then?' It was published, and when two women wrote to tell him that God spoke to them through this sermon, saved them from despair, and sent them forth as missionaries, Gossip believed that this was the price he had to pay to make Christian missionaries out of these two souls

who had completely lost their faith. We cannot make Christians on the cheap. It demands sacrifice of the most heroic order; and that Christ expects of us in the Church.

Such, it would appear, is Luke's interpretation of this saying of Jesus. He imagines Jesus with His eye on the fishermen salting the fish at the quayside. See what a frightful price the salt has to pay to do its saving work. It has to dissolve, to surrender its very essence, to destroy itself. In like manner the Church cannot fulfil its primary task in this irreligious age, which is the evangelistic one of making Christians out of men of every clime, class, and outlook, unless it faces up to the sacrifice demanded and makes it.

When Luther spoke to people on great religious issues at his supper table he had a habit of fastening on the homeliest of things to make his point clear, such as the garden, the children playing, something in the room. No doubt he copied this from his Lord. Jesus had a genius for fixing on the common things of life and, through them, made many of the profundities of the gospel plain. And, when He pointed to that common commodity, salt, which means so much to man in his struggle to live, He was seeking to bring something of importance home to all of us in the Church, whether we accept the interpretation of Matthew, or of Mark, or of Luke.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT

Facing the Tests of Life

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, M.A.,
EDINBURGH

'In that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.'—He 2¹⁸.

Here in this text are two words, 'suffered' and 'tempted,' which form, sooner or later, in one way or another, part of every human being's experience of life. It is the glory of the Christian gospel that God in Jesus Christ knew the whole of that experience, and knew it all in the only way in which it can be truly known, from the inside. The Apostles' Creed sums up the whole earthly life of Jesus in one phrase, 'suffered under Pontius Pilate.' There is nothing about His life, His growth at Nazareth, His ministry, His words and works; just 'suffered,' as if that one word described the deepest part of human experience, and, on the principle that the greater includes the less, implied His sharing of all other ills to which the flesh is heir. It is said that Kathleen Ferrier was always strangely drawn to a song about a picture of the child Jesus under a tree, the tree from which the Cross was to be hewn,

and as the child grew, so the tree grew, till they were nailed together. What drew her to that pang? Was it an artist's sense of reality, or some strange premonition of her own destiny? Certain it is that suffering of some sort and in some degree is part of human destiny. Now here the writer of Hebrews adds another allied idea, that He was tempted at all points like as we are. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that the word 'temptation' almost inevitably is coloured by its specifically moral or religious connotation. Give it its original root meaning of 'testing' and how obviously this is another inescapable human experience. Testing is part of life. As a test pilot subjects a new plane to every sort of strain and stress, soaring, diving, turning, twisting, and as in the process every particle of metal and fabric, every detail of design and construction, every part of the engines, tried to the ten-thousandth part of an inch is being tested, so God has decreed that life shall test us all. We are here to be tried and tested, mainly by the things we are called upon to suffer. When that happens, Christ is able to help us, for He has been through it Himself.

We are tempted to resent being caught and held by our own personal situation. Jesus stood before Pilate with His hands bound; we do not know how tightly the bonds were drawn but they were at least inescapable. All His life He suffered from being bound. By birth and heritage He was bound to a little people, held in the grip of a great militaristic power which determined both the place of His birth and the manner of His death. He belonged among the kind of folk whose children can be slaughtered to make a tyrant sit safer on his throne, who can be herded as refugees along the roads. He was tied for eighteen years to a carpenter's shop in a small town; He was bound by His own personal situation. So are we all, born as we are at a particular time and in a particular place. To a large extent our hands are tied from the moment of birth, by the economic situation, the educational possibilities, the intellectual endowment that happen to be ours. Being bound is part of the pain of being a man, and we are sorely tempted to resent it. Why am I handicapped the way I am, tied by my own limitations, my own mistakes and failures and sins? Why is it my lot to live at this particular time, in a century that has seen two disastrous wars already and holds today such horrid shape of things to come? Why must my home and living lie in this little land, too near the storm-centres of Europe, so precariously supporting too large a population? Why have I to grow up here and now, to bring up my children in this setting, with the shadow of fear never quite lifted; why is there not for me and mine some Shangri La, some lost horizon of true security,

some safer land? Well may questions like these arise in the minds of, say, lads on National Service in Cyprus, young couples facing marriage and home-building, or wondering what sort of a world this is into which to bring children. Then from it all we turn to Jesus Christ as the web of circumstance tightened, the net of intrigue, hatred, jealousy, cruelty closed about Him. We hear Him praying: 'Father, save me from this hour.' Then He faces the testing, the temptation: 'But for this cause came I into this hour. Father, glorify thy name.' To Pilate, with His hands still bound, He says: 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world.' When we suffer being bound He is still able to help us to face that test. This is my destiny, as I am, where I am, being who and what I am; here lies God's purpose and plan for me. God help me to find it, to see it, to serve it, and, where I cannot see it, to go on believing in it.

We are tempted to put self in the centre when we are called upon to suffer in any way. There are many kinds and levels of suffering. When life gets in our way, when our best laid schemes 'gang aft agley,' as Burns put it, when we are thwarted, disappointed, frustrated, that constitutes suffering of a very real kind. Perhaps the worst form of this type of suffering is personal disillusionment, when some one you trusted fails you miserably. How well Jesus knew that for Himself! The crowd drifted away, the religious leaders grew more and more suspicious and hostile. His friends failed to understand. His own chosen Twelve betrayed, denied, deserted Him. Such mental suffering, such torment of mind He knew full well. There is physical agony, the agony of the Roman lash, studded with slivers of bone, lacerating the back; agony like that of a stone in the kidney or a perforation, where there is no reality but the awful pain. Here again, the mental element still enters in, like the terrible anticipation of the daily dressing of an amputation. 'We may not know, we cannot tell what pains He had to bear' yet they at least included agony in that degree. Deepest of all lies the element of spiritual suffering, the dreadful sense of the whole life's fight being fought in vain, all the effort fading as if it had never been, the agony of shame or sorrow shared, the bitterness of parting. All these Christ knew, and all of them we all must know, in some degree, sooner or later. We all must face the testing of the time when there is no reality but suffering, when the cloud covers the whole sky, when black darkness swallows up every light. In that hour we watch Him in an agony in Gethsemane, wrestling with His own suffering self, getting self out of the centre: 'Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.' We must all learn somehow to do the same. The hardest idol of all

to displace is the hurt self. This is life's most dangerous and testing hour, when we are vulnerable, hypersensitive, in peril of developing a grudge against life and against God. Only Christ can succour us in that testing.

We are tempted to miss any positive purpose in suffering, and to be content with what we call 'Christian resignation.' What is the best most of us can manage when our plans have miscarried, our desires are thwarted, our hopes are too long deferred or finally destroyed, when life has not worked out, when there is nothing left but real pain and inescapable hurt, that does not grow less or ever get better? Is it not to say: 'God has sent this, or at least permitted it, and I must just bow before His will, and accept it with as good grace as I can'? Yet how much greater is the reaction we can learn from Christ. Christian faith takes its stand on the amazing assumption that out of suffering, rightly handled, new and positive good can come. A woman who had lost count of the operations she had undergone for cancer, and who for months had never been free from pain, said one day to her minister: 'I feel that this suffering is something with which God is trusting me.' Those who knew Kathleen Ferrier best all felt that in the last months of her brave struggle against illness and pain a new deep quality came into her already lovely voice, as if by wrestling with this testing, bitter experience, she won, not only enrichment for herself, but an enhancement of the gift she used as a blessing to others. To take suffering, to refuse to let it defeat you, or bludgeon you into mere negative resignation, but out of it to bring enrichment of a rarer sympathy, and a deepened quality of living which you pass on to other lives, that is victory indeed. No one but Christ is able to succour those who face this, the ultimate test of life, and teach them His own secret of turning thorns into a crown, and a cross into a throne.

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT

Growing Worse

By THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL H. F. WOODHOUSE,
B.A., H.Dip.Ed., D.D., VANCOUVER, CANADA

'The last state of that man is worse than the first.'—
Lk 11²⁶.

Growing worse. Is it possible? We all know perhaps of a tree which showed great promise and yet whose performance has been faulty. Perhaps we know someone whose youth displayed great promise and age has turned into the sere and yellow leaf. It may even be our own familiar friend. But for me—is it possible that I can grow worse? We are appalled at the prospect and we shrink. Could our life show a process of defeat,

deterioration, finally destruction? Yes, it can. That is why we have to take an objective view of ourselves. That is why we have to value Lent as a time when we review our whole life and think what we are to do lest we grow worse.

What practical steps are we to take to avoid such a fate, to prevent ourselves sliding further down such a slippery slope?

It has been suggested by a famous moral theologian that there are certain definite steps which can help. These steps apply to every one of us because any of us may go from bad to worse.

What then are we to do? *Break the habits* leading to spiritual decline. This is much easier said than done and perhaps the best way of trying to break a bad habit is to change it to a good habit. Lent gives us the chance. 'Search me, O God, and . . . try my ways,' says the Psalmist and each of us may repeat his words concerning our own lives so that it may not be said of us that the last state of that man was worse than the first. The first thing then that we can do, nay must do, is to break and change bad habits.

Next, *remove the occasions* which cause us to stumble. Once more we shall not find this easy, but what will it profit us if we lose our soul? There is need to examine our life to see if and where we walk in the counsel of the ungodly, stand in the way of sinners and sit in the seat of the scornful. Here are the occasions which lead to spiritual defeat and they must be removed. Soul surgery may need to go as deep as a cure for cancer. These occasions may be in our work, in our play, in our friendships, even in our homes. But as far as possible the occasions must be removed.

Our cause of spiritual defeat may lie in bad habits, occasions leading to sin or both. As well it may come from *incorrect ideas*.

We shall have to examine our life and see if there are ideas which should be corrected. What is our scale of values? What ideas find a ready access into our mind? Do they tend to ennoble us or to degrade us? 'As a man thinketh in his heart so is he.' If sinful ideas, or ideas which lead to sin, find ready access they are bound to issue in words and deeds whose final outcome will be that it will be said of you or of me 'The last state of that man is worse than the first.'

Instead of wrong ideas we should above all contemplate the life and teaching of Christ; let His example and words fill our minds.

Spiritual defeat may come from one or more of these causes. Bad habits, sinful occasions, wrong ideas may cause defeat. It may also come from *feelings and emotions which harm and hinder* rather than help. Here again we have to turn to self-examination and see if thoughts of envy, hatred,

malice, or lack of love are poisoning the very citadel of life. Also the best cure will be to speak words of love and do loving actions, ever keeping before us the words and deeds of Christ. That will be the surest way to change the emotions and the passions which cause spiritual defeat.

Here, then, are four causes any or all of which may cause spiritual disease. The cure for such disease will be to break those habits, remove those occasions, correct those ideas, stop those feelings. As we bend all our powers to this end we do well to remember that working out our own salvation God is also ready and able to work in us of His good pleasure which is that we should not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewing of our mind.

If this does not take place we shall grow worse. Here is an unpleasant fact, yet we cannot seal off unpleasant truth by locking ourselves in an air-tight chamber. Failings grow on people. Have we not often said of someone, referring to a bad habit, 'Poor so-and-so he cannot break it, he is incurable.' What if people are saying this of us?

What if this is happening in our own lives and you and I are perhaps unaware and blind to what is obvious to those who know us well. Unwittingly we may be like the man travelling on swampy ground beginning to flounder and going deeper and deeper.

We cannot stand still spiritually. We go back or we go forward. We cannot stay spiritually 'six for ever and ever' any more than we can do so physically. Now is the time to take stock; others may be saying of us, 'he is becoming more mean, more bad-tempered, or harder to get on with.'

Yet we take it for granted that if we change it will be for the better, but it may be for the worse. We respectable people, we regular church-goers, we constant communicants since last Lent, we may have altered—for the worse. A dreadful thought! Yet possible. Faults develop, sin spreads. The person who tends to be lazy, careless, impatient, proud, in ten years' time may be completely in bondage to those faults. Their octopus grip makes his last state worse than his first.

The worst thing of all is that this is not general or impersonal. It means me or it means you. Our occasions for sin may multiply, our habits leading to wrong become stronger, ideas that will destroy us may become more numerous and we may absorb them more easily. Our wrong feelings may spread and develop in intensity.

Is it not time, should we not welcome the Lenten season as a chance to make a special effort to break such habits, remove such occasions, correct such ideas, change such feelings? Now it

is high time. Let not 'the native hue of resolution be sicklied o'er.' It may be now or never; urgency is the note. There is a sleep from which we may not awake. Now it is high time to make sure that we are alive to this danger so that no one who knows us may be able to say of you or of me 'the last state of that man is worse than the first.' Above all, that the all-seeing and all-knowing God, looking at us as we were, as we are and as we shall be, should not say 'the last state of that man is worse than the first.'

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT

Fools for Christ's Sake

BY THE REVEREND ADAM W. BURNET, D.D.,
LATE OF ST. CUTHBERT'S, EDINBURGH

'We are fools for Christ's sake.'—I Co 4¹⁰.

The followers of our Lord in the early days bore many names, such as 'believers,' 'disciples,' 'Christians' and, by far the commonest, 'saints,' but if regard be had to what Christianity looks like, and will always look like, in the eyes of an unbelieving world, no name applied to Christ's people is more pungently expressive than this word 'fools.' Paul, in one of his not unusual moments of inspiration hits upon it here as a label for those who, like himself, had turned their backs upon earthly prizes for what had no value at all, save in the eyes of faith.

'We are fools,' he says, 'for Christ's sake.' He knew well what a born idiot he must seem to men who went in for money and clothes, for popularity and worldly success. It needed no stretch of imagination to see that to all such people he was out on a wild-goose chase, flying in the face of ordinary common sense, and making shipwreck of life's opportunities for the silliest fad. 'Why should a man fling himself away like that?' says Mr. Worldly Wiseman in the allegory, and Paul, taking for the moment that all-too-prevailing point of view, says (not one whit abashed or discomfited, but altogether proud and content) 'Yes, we are fools,' and then adds the significant, entirely vindicating words, 'for Christ's sake.'

Browning has a memorable poem, *Mulýkeh*, in which the blessed kind of folly that Paul has in mind receives a worthy celebration. It tells of Hóseyn, an Arab, who owns a lovely mare called Pearl, a marvel for speed and never once beaten. One day a thief rides off with her and Hóseyn, as if she had taken his very heart with her, sets off in pursuit, riding her rival. The thief is strange to his mount; Pearl is losing ground, and Hóseyn overtaking her. Not even then able to bear the

thought of the loved one's defeat he shouts the secret to the thief,

Touch the right ear and press with your foot
my Pearl's left flank,

and Pearl dashes away like the wind, to be lost for ever. He would rather lose her than see her disgraced. His friends give vent to their pity—

Poor Hóseyn is crazed past hope.

Hóseyn can only say weeping,

You never have loved my Pearl!

But we need go no further than the Scriptures for this kind of behaviour that to the general world will hardly make sense. Abraham turning his back on Ur of the Chaldees and all its security, because there his faith would have been stifled; Isaac in his gentle way yielding to the greedy herdmen of Gerar well after well that had been his father's, and which he might have felt he had the right to keep at the sword's point; Moses, with Egypt's alluring prizes offering themselves, going out to his brethren and the punishing years in the wilderness; David, with the water that three brave men risked their lives to win from the well of Bethlehem, pouring it solemnly out on the ground to the glory of God because it looked to him like their life-blood; David again, sparing the life of the half-mad king who was hunting him down—these, and such as these—for there are many more in these pages—proclaim themselves wonderful, heavenly fools who must have been a laughing-stock to many of their generation. Surely some one looking on in each case must have felt like saying, 'Did you ever see such stark insanity?'

But these saints of God only paved the way for One, incomparably greater, who far, far outdid them all in this blessed foolishness. Those we have named had their day when some selfish passion decided for them. In Jesus's life what Paul calls 'the foolishness of God' was the unbroken main-spring. When He left Nazareth and plunged into a career that left Him hardly time to eat or sleep, His family were sure He was 'beside Himself.' Tempted in His vast pity for men to take this or that short-cut to His Kingdom He deliberately chose a long perilous track on which He knew He never could save Himself. With power to dominate the minds of men He chose rather to plead with them. On people without the wit to see their privilege He kept pouring out the wealth of His love even when they repaid Him with scorn and spite. Wistfully He looked across at Gentile lands less bigoted than His own, but gave Himself to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' And when at length the road of self-renouncing loyalty to God and man brought Him face to face with a

terrible death, He refused to be separated from His enemies, humbly took the place they gave Him and embraced the ordeal by crucifixion. In all that gallery of the glorious fools of God, 'world-losers and world-forsakers,' He stands out in solitary, ineffable splendour; all His days flinging Himself away and in that last crowning hour achieving, as Stopford Brooke calls it, 'the most triumphant act of pure love the world has ever seen,' the Resurrection attesting that love of His to be the very love of God. So He was our Saviour.

It should be plain enough—so that he who runs may read—what it means to be 'fools for Christ's sake.' What is it but living as He lived, bearing one's cross after Him, all the time crucifying the natural man? It means refusing an easy advantage when taking it would leave us with a soiled conscience; mortifying some wrong desire though the gratification of it be within easy reach; living above retaliation though there is nothing to prevent it. It means to be humble, content to be set aside or unthanked, to make ventures of faith when believing seems madness. It means, to sum up in Loyola's words, 'to give and not to count the cost; to fight and not to heed the wounds . . . to labour and not to seek for any reward save that of knowing that we do Thy will.'

There's a tall order for you! *Yet it is no more than the distinctively Christian way of living*, and if we have anything of God's Spirit in us we salute it as alone worthy of His people. High as the standard is, we have it in us to approve it. L. P. Jacks says somewhere that it is one of the strangest paradoxes of life that in days of war we ardently wish for our sons what we are far from hoping they will wish for themselves. 'Because I love my son I will his safety, but if he puts that first, would it not strike a chill to the heart? *Why do I love him?—because he despises the safety in which I would keep him!*' From which the writer deduces that a deeper will in us is on the side of self-renunciation.

It was to enthrone that deeper will in us as the commanding principle of our lives that Jesus went on to suffer the worst that men could do to Him, to make us indeed children of that Father who, 'for reasons that the reason knows not of,' 'maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.'

There our Lord hung in all the defencelessness of love, in all 'the weakness of God,' and ten thousand times ten thousand have been able to do nothing but worship Him, confessing with shame their mean, self-saving ways. They have prayed for forgiveness and that Cross has convinced them of it. Reconciled to God, made one with Him, they have received His Spirit, thereby

ing for one thing only—to live no more for ourselves but for Him who died for them. Thus they have been inspired to follow in the print of Christ's shoe and to be fools for His sake.

This is the only way to become and remain a true servant of Jesus Christ. Sentimental admiration will get us nowhere, nor will putting moral pressure on ourselves. But by that way of worship, penitence, forgiveness, inspiration, most certainly the power to follow Him is ours.

Nor does this 'foolishness' entail a dreary way of living though it leads away from what half the world is craving. For gratitude to the Saviour can turn statutes into songs, and love to Him can

make the long miles lightsome, the yokes easy, and the burdens light. There is no life so rich and satisfying, and at the end of it there waits for us 'the blessed country,' the light perpetual, the peace eternal, and the joy that cannot be spoken.

If love should count you worthy, and should deign

One day to seek your door and be your guest,

Pause : ere you draw the bolt and bid him rest,
If in your old content you would remain ;

How wise [in the world's eyes] you were to open
not ! and yet,

How poor if you should turn him from the door !

Contributions and Comments

The Biblical Conception of 'Faith'

MAY I plead for a reconsideration of the view of 'faith' advanced by Professor T. F. Torrance ? (January number [lxviii. 111]). I know that it has become popular, especially since Father Hebert's article (*Theology*, lviii, No. 424 [October 1955]), to which he refers. But I cannot help thinking, with all due respect, that it is a false trail.

Of course we all thankfully recognize that any response of ours to the gospel is the work of God's grace in us, and of course trust in God cannot exist without God's trustworthiness, which, for Christians, is manifested and mediated in the Incarnation. Of course *πίστις* in the New Testament carries in it the overtones of this fact and of the expressions used in the Old Testament for God's faithfulness. And it may indeed be that sometimes Jesus' own faith or faithfulness is alluded to (cf. Westcott on He 12²).

But to say that *πίστις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, etc. generally includes the faithfulness of Christ as its main ingredient is (so it seems to me) to ignore at least four important considerations :

1. So far as grammar goes, the loose genitive may be objective rather than subjective ; cf. *ὑπακοή πίστεως*, Ro 1⁵ (perhaps), *ἡ δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς*, Ro 8²¹, and (pace Torrance's astounding interpretation) *πίστις ἀληθείας*, 2 Th 2¹³. Were I not out of reach of books at the time of writing, I might add other examples.

2. The verb *πιστεύω* is sometimes used unmistakably with Christ as object (or implied object) in parallel contexts ; and so is *πίστις* itself (and even *πιστός*) with a preposition.

3. *πίστις*, used absolutely, clearly means the believer's faith (or credence) in such passages as Gal 3^{2, 5}, Ro 10¹⁷ (cf. Is 53¹).

4. To throw so much weight upon what God in Christ has done is, in the passages adduced by Professor Torrance, seriously to reduce necessary reference to man's act of will in response to God's approach.

It may well be that the genitive after *ἀγάπη* is more often subjective than objective ; but I submit that this is very far from proven of the genitive after *πίστις*. Has false exegesis here been pressed into the service of a truth which is already well established from elsewhere ?

C. F. D. MOULE

Cambridge

The Virgin Birth in St. Luke

IN his article on the Virgin Birth (October, 1956), Canon H. E. W. Turner rejects the reading of the Latin MS *b* at Lk 2³⁴ ; the evidence is admittedly slight, although enough to convince Streeter that this was what Luke originally wrote. If this reading is accepted, the Virgin Birth certainly disappears from Luke's Gospel. Your contributor then proceeds on the assumption that the usual reading at Lk 2³⁴ tells of a Virgin Birth.

This is the assumption which is usually made, but is it justified ? Luke says that at the time of the angel's visit Mary was not married (2²⁷) ; she herself protests this in *v.* 34. But neither she nor the angel says that she will not 'know any man' ; the assurance is simply given that she will receive the Spirit and be 'overshadowed' by the power of God, and her son will be called 'holy, Son of God.' This is quite different from Mt 1¹⁸. There is no hint in Luke that the child was to have no earthly father. The case of Elizabeth is quoted as a parallel (*v.* 36), and nobody has ever suggested that the birth of John was virginal.

There is nothing inconsistent in this passage with the view that, probably shortly afterwards, Mary became the wife of Joseph (as indeed she was at the time of Jesus' birth, on the reading of Lk 3⁵ accepted by Creed, *in loc.*) and they had a son who was indeed 'holy, Son of God,' and whose Mother was endowed with the Spirit of God. If we had not known the narrative in Matthew, nobody would have deduced a Virgin Birth from Luke's story alone.

HAROLD A. GUY

Southampton

1 Corinthians ii. 8

IN the October number (lxviii. 26) Mr. Ling argues that the phrase 'the rulers of this world' can only mean 'human rulers,' so no reference to spirit powers can be allowed. However, the 'either-or' approach is not very helpful here. To determine the meaning of the phrase, it is surely necessary to consider it not merely in the light of the context and the linguistic usage for *οἱ ἄρχοντες* but also against the background of Paul's *dæmonology*, which is more developed than that of the Synoptic Gospels, Luke-Acts and the Johannine writings. The study of the Pauline usage of such words as *ἄρχαί*, *ἐξουσίαι*, *θρόνοι* and similar designations of authority is very relevant for determining the meaning of *οἱ ἄρχοντες* in 1 Co 2⁸. The picture that results from such a study makes it very probable that in 1 Co 2⁸ as well as in Ro 13³ *οἱ ἄρχοντες*

refers to *both* human rulers and the spirit powers that lie behind them. Such a concept originated in Judaism which asserted that there is a particular angel for each people. The angels are subject to God because they are created, but though subject in power they are often hostile. In the Judaic faith there is not the same rigid dualism that is characteristic of the Gnostic systems. An excellent exposition of this point of view is found in Oscar Cullmann's great book *Christ and Time* (S.C.M. Eng. Tr. F. V. Filson, 37 n., 103 f., 191-199). Man sees only the visible deeds executed by the earthly agents of the invisible powers and authorities, *τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα* (Col 1¹⁶).

As for the question of the responsibility for the crucifixion, it seems precarious to suppose that the spirit powers knew what would happen at the cross in view of Col 2¹⁵ 'He cut away the angelic Rulers and Powers from us, exposing them to all the world and triumphing over them in the cross' (Moffatt). For if that were the case then the crucifixion is the result of sinful men who reject the offer of God in Christ as well as resist the influence of the hostile spirit powers who would be trying to prevent their own downfall in the cross. Surely Paul would agree that the wisdom of this world, at even its highest level namely that of *ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ αἵματος* (Eph 2²), utterly fails to comprehend the Divine plan of Salvation revealed in the cross.

In the light of these considerations it appears that 1 Co 2⁸ is congruous with both Col 2¹⁵ and Ac 3¹⁷ 13²⁷.

W. J. PETER BOYD

Devizes

Recent Foreign Theology

Ezekiel. In 1936 the late Professor Bertholet edited Ezekiel in Eissfeldt's *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, with some assistance from Galling. The commentary differed widely from an older commentary on this Book which Bertholet had edited before the turn of the century. Now a new commentary has appeared in Eissfeldt's *Handbuch* to replace Bertholet-Galling, and once more it differs markedly from its predecessor.¹ It is written by Georg Fohrer, but again Galling contributes, though the delimitation of the passages assigned to him differs slightly. On no book of the Old Testament has opinion been in so much ferment as on this Book during the past thirty years, and the present commentary reflects to-day's greater caution in rejecting passages from the text. The revolutionary theories on the date and place of

Ezekiel's ministry are still very much alive, but the reviewer is glad to find that they are not here advocated, and that sobriety and balance are the marks of this fine commentary. As in all the volumes of this series we have a new translation of the text, followed by textual notes in small type and then by the general paragraph-by-paragraph exegesis.

The Message of Deutero-Isaiah. A new volume of the Dutch series of *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, written in English, is devoted entirely to the study of Deutero-Isaiah, and comes from the pen of Professor P. A. H. de Boer.² It begins with a new translation of Is 40-55, marked by a number of original renderings. This is followed by brief notes, where, *inter alia*, the reader will find the author's

¹ *Ezekiel* (*Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, i. 13) [1955]. Mohr, Tübingen; DM 20.80, or bound 23.50.

² *Second Isaiah's Message* (*Oudtestamentische Studiën*, Deel xi.) [1956]. Brill; Leiden.

tification of many of the new renderings. Little is made of the readings of the Dead Sea Scroll Isaiah, DSIa, and this is deliberate. A separate chapter is devoted to the consideration of the variants of this MS, where the author maintains that undue account is sometimes taken of it, and there a very modest view of its textual importance is taken. In this he is almost certainly right. Even a poor MS may occasionally preserve a genuine reading; but it must have very strong intrinsic probability if it rests only on a poor MS, such as DSIa quite certainly is. Another chapter is devoted to Is 51¹, which Professor de Boer interprets of God and not of Abraham, and whose verbs he reads in the active and not in the passive. Yahweh is thus held to have been the rock and the well, hewed out and dug by the people. Here it is not so easy to be persuaded. The remaining chapters discuss the message of Deutero-Isaiah and the interpretation of the Servant. Here the universalism which most scholars find is denied, and the Servant is interpreted of Israel, but with many new lines of approach. While the reviewer feels that much is explained away, rather than explained, he welcomes the challenge to widely accepted views. It is by such challenges that we are saved from a too easy acceptance and forced to re-examine the texts.

The Last Supper. From a Roman Catholic scholar, H. Schürmann, comes a close study of the words of institution in the Lukan account of the Last Supper.¹ This forms the second part of a study on the whole Lukan account of the Supper, contained in Lk 22⁷⁻³⁸. In this part the author examines minutely the Lukan account of the words of institution in relation to the Marcan account and the account of Paul contained in 1 Co 11. He reaches the conclusion that Luke is independent of both Mark and Paul, so far as Lk 22¹⁹. 20a is concerned, but that 22^{20b} may have been taken from Mark. He thinks Luke is nearer to the pre-Lukan *Urbericht*, which he reconstructs as follows: *καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας (εὐλογήσας?) ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· (λάβετε?) τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δευπνήσαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου.* That Luke had older written sources before him is indicated in the prologue to his Gospel, and Schürmann assigns to one of these sources the text of Lk 22¹⁵⁻¹⁸. 19-20a.

¹ *Der Einsetzungsbericht Lk 22, 19-20: II. Teil einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22, 7-38 (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, xix. Heft 5) [1955].* Aschendorff, Münster; DM 10.80.

Devotional Study of the Sayings of Jesus. The same author, H. Schürmann, has issued a small book, under the title *The Lord's Words*,² of devotional value. The sayings of Jesus are classified in twenty-five sections. Each section is supplied with a short introduction, its separate sub-sections consisting of a selection of texts brought together from various places in the Synoptic Gospels, followed by a brief comment. This little book is of pocket size, and is well adapted to the devotional study of the Gospels.

The Sabbath and Political Prophecy. From Switzerland also come two studies by Dr. E. Jenni. The first is a brief one dealing with the Sabbath in the Old Testament.³ As is well known, the motive for the observance of the Sabbath set forth in Exodus differs from that set forth in Deuteronomy. That in Exodus is connected with the Priestly Code and the first account of Creation, and is more theological than that in Deuteronomy. Dr. Jenni devotes his study particularly to the examination of this theological motivation, and finishes by considering the Sabbath in the light of the words and works of Jesus, who is the fulfilment of the Sabbath. The view that the Sabbath goes back in Israel as far as Moses is here accepted, though its ultimate origin cannot be established.

The second study is devoted to the political predictions of the prophets.⁴ After a brief general treatment of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the other prophets, the author turns to a number of specific predictions, such as Isaiah's against Shebna, Jeremiah's against Shallum, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Hananiah, or Isaiah's predictions concerning the Syro-Ephraimitish war, the Fall of Samaria, the Assyrian victory over Egypt, and Sennacherib's campaign against Jerusalem, Jeremiah's prediction of the duration of the Babylonian exile, and Ezekiel's prediction of the capture of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar. While some of these found an exact fulfilment, it is clear that others did not. Dr. Jenni analyses and groups them, and then passes to consider whether the literal fulfilment is the only, or the true, test of the fulfilment of these prophecies. These are both valuable and suggestive little studies.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University

² *Worte des Herrn: Jesu Botschaft vom Königtum Gottes, auf Grund der synoptischen Überlieferung zusammengestellt [1955].* St. Benno Verlag, Leipzig.

³ *Die theologische Begründung des Sabbatgebotes im Alten Testament* (Theologische Studien, ed. Karl Barth, No. 46) [1956]. Evangelischer Verlag, Zollikon-Zürich; Fr. 3.60.

⁴ *Die politische Voraussagen der Propheten* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, ed. by W. Eichrodt and O. Cullmann) [1956]. Zwingli Verlag; Fr. 14.

Entre Nous

An Indian Saint

It may well be held that of all forms of literature autobiography is most interesting, and of all forms of autobiography the story of a spiritual pilgrimage is most moving. It will not be surprising if *Premanand: The Autobiography of the Rev. Premanand Anath Nath Sen* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net) comes to be regarded as one of the spiritual classics of the world.

Premanand was born into a wealthy and aristocratic Indian family in which he was brought up in luxury. His family was a clan; there were times in the year, on special occasions, when more than two hundred of them, fathers, uncles, cousins, sisters, brothers and grandchildren, sat down to a meal together. Not only was the family rich and high-born; it was also devout and the worship of the family deities was reverently observed.

In his youth Premanand was bitterly opposed to Christianity, so much so that he and his young friends did everything possible to obstruct and to break up the meetings of the missionaries by causing all kinds of disturbances. They deliberately bought up portions of the Gospels and hymn sheets to make bonfires of them. Then one day Premanand and his friends formed a plan. They would raid and burn down the thatched hut which the missionaries used as a reading room, and as a storehouse for their books. On the night before the planned raid Premanand broke into the hut and stole a Bible. He began to read it—and he began to be a changed man. 'The Bible I stole from the reading room . . . eventually stole me from my old self and from my family and friends.'

He had not chosen an easy way. Active persecution, tears, entreaties, threats were used to dissuade him. Hardest to bear was his mother's grief. Finally an attack on his life made it necessary for Premanand to leave home. Then began a spiritual odyssey. He worked in the Office of Public Works and on the railways. Finally he trained as a priest. He worked with the Y.M.C.A. and with the C.M.S., and later he worked among the lepers who were utterly outcast and utterly neglected.

He has wonderful stories to tell, for Premanand finds it impossible to say anything against any one. When he left home he went to Ranchi and met Bishop Whitley. 'I had a new vision of Christ, when I actually saw Christ's life of love, sacrifice and self-denial in the everyday life of the Bishop. He became actually the epistle of Christ to me.' Later in Calcutta he met Father Brown of the Oxford Mission. Father Brown was the friend of the friendless, especially of the little street boys. In later days, in other parts of India, men who had studied in Calcutta University used to ask

Premanand: 'Is that friend of the Calcutta street boys still alive, who used to walk arm in arm with the poor?' He tells of Dr. J. N. Farquhar who used to ask him after he had become an evangelist: 'Well, Sen, are you a Missionary or a Machinery?'—a question that any minister of the gospel might well ask himself. He tells of Colonel Kirwang who looked after him when he was ill, and who would take no pay. 'When I once pressed Colonel Kirwan to accept a fee, he tapped me on the back and said that my prayers for him would be his remuneration.'

Premanand has wise things to say on many things. He shows how the minister of Christ must never be in a hurry: 'My own experience has been that when I or any other missionary or Indian priest shows signs of restlessness or impatience towards any educated and thoughtful Christian or non-Christian visitors, and gave them to understand that we were hard-pressed for time, or that it was our lunch- or tea-time and that we could not wait, then at once such enquirers were lost, and never returned again.' Truly the Christian minister cannot keep one eye on the clock. He speaks nobly of the unity of the Church: 'I speak as a Christian, God is my Father, the Church is my Mother, Christian is my name; Catholic is my surname. Catholic, because we belong to nothing less than the Church universal. Do we need any other names? Why go on to add Anglican, Episcopalian, Protestant, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregational, Baptist, and so on, and so on? These terms are divisive, sectarian, narrow. They shrivel up one's soul.' 'I maintain,' he says, 'that a Church which has lost its hunger and thirst for souls can no more survive than a man who has lost his appetite.' 'People,' he says, 'do not want only to read the Gospel according to Matthew, Luke or Mark. They want to see the Gospel according to me. What kind of Gospel do I show forth?'

Premanand died before he could put the last part of this book into final form; but the last part is a meditation on Christ and the love of God. 'Memory sleeps, action sleeps, thought sleeps,' he writes, 'but love is awake.'

No man could read this simple, humble, radiant book and not lay it down nearer to the Risen Christ.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.